

A HISTORY
OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE

*DURING THE MACCABEAN AND ROMAN PERIODS
(INCLUDING NEW TESTAMENT
TIMES)*

BY
JAMES STEVENSON RIGGS, D.D.
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM, AUBURN THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

WITH MAPS AND CHART

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS


1908

Copyright, 1900,
BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

To my Friend

CHARLES E. ROBINSON, D.D.

WHOSE AFFECTION AND COUNSEL HAVE BEEN AMONG
THE CHOICE BLESSINGS OF MY LIFE



PREFACE

As part of the history of the Jews from earliest days to the time when Christianity became independent of Judaism, the story of the Maccabean revolt and of the Roman domination has often been told. From the fact, however, that a large part of the story belongs to inter-testamental times, its interest has often been overshadowed by that of the strictly biblical history. Now the earnest historical study of the life and times of Jesus has brought us to a clearer realization of the vital importance of an understanding of the whole development of post-exilic Judaism. Every record of events and every piece of literature contributing toward that understanding has, therefore, been studied anew. In the light of the results of this study, we have attempted to tell the story. Whatever may be the comparative worth of these periods, they are certainly not surpassed in the annals of history in pathetic suffering and indomitable heroism. The brave struggle of a nation for the maintenance of its convictions is always of the deepest interest. Thereby not only its character, but also the value of its convictions is revealed. Pre-eminently is the study of these thrilling periods of the history of the Jews the study of just such a revelation. Judaism was under a searching test. Its beliefs and hopes were tried as by fire. Old

faiths became more explicit, and national hopes were intensified. Indeed, the very conditions were brought about which made it impossible for Jesus to gain the ear of the nation and to save it from itself. While, therefore, this work is meant to be a history of the Jewish people for two hundred and forty years of its existence, it is no less a contribution toward the interpretation of the gospels in so far as a knowledge of the faiths, conditions, and aims of Judaism can be interpretative of the form and method of the activity of Jesus.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professors Charles F. Kent, Ph.D., and Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D., for their valuable critical suggestions and for their cordial assistance whenever needed.

AUBURN, FEB. 9, 1900.

JAMES STEVENSON RIGGS.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE MACCABEAN PERIOD OF JEWISH HISTORY

I

THE HISTORICAL SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD

SECTIONS 1-10. PAGES 1-13

SECTION 1. Limits of the period. 2. Sources of information. 3. The First Book of Maccabees. 4. The Second Book of Maccabees. 5. The Jewish War and Antiquities of Josephus. 6. The Book of Daniel and the Book of Enoch. 7. The main literary interest of Alexandrian Judaism. 8. The beginnings of philosophic harmonization in Alexandria. 9. The Book of Wisdom. 10. The Sibylline Oracles.

II

THE CAUSES AND OCCASION OF THE MACCABEAN UPRISING

SECTIONS 11-26. PAGES 14-28

SECTION 11. The spiritual forces in conflict. 12. Hellenism in Judea. 13. The uncompromising spirit of Judaism. 14. The increasing antagonism of Judaism to Hellenism. 15. Antiochus Epiphanes and the high-priesthood. 16. The treachery of Menelaus. 17. Jason's venture and its terrible issue in Jerusalem. 18. The Romans meet Antiochus in Egypt. 19. The disastrous result of that meeting to the Jews. 20. Jerusalem's destruction and the flight of many of its citizens. 21.

The time of sifting; the impulse toward expanding the canon of Scripture. 22. The faith that would not swerve. 23. The fidelity of Mattathias in Modein. 24. The uplifting of the standard of Judaism. 25. The beginning of the struggle. 26. The company of the Hasideans and the death of Mattathias.

III

THE SUCCESSFUL STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

SECTIONS 27-43. PAGES 29-44

SECTION 27. The sons of Mattathias. 28. The victories of Judas over Apollonius and Seron. 29. The army under Nicanor, Ptolemy, and Gorgias that was to root out the Jews. 30. Its double discomfiture. 31. The battle of Bethsur. 32. The restoration and rededication of the temple. 33. Judaism takes fresh courage; it guards anew the temple and inquires after its sacred writings. 34. Judas devotes attention to neighboring hostile peoples. 35. The successful campaigns in Galilee and across the Jordan. 36. The unfortunate attempt of Joseph and Azarias. 37. The death of Antiochus Epiphanes. 38. The ensuing rivalries in the Syrian court. 39. The battle of Bethzacharias. 40. The second part of the Book of Enoch. 41. Judaism's dark hour. 42. Unexpected deliverance and complete religious freedom. 43. The situation in Judea.

IV

THE LONG CONTEST FOR POLITICAL FREEDOM

SECTIONS 44-57. PAGES 45-57

SECTION 44. The new reason for conflict; the high-priest Alcimus. 45. Startling changes in the Syrian court. 46. Bacchides installs Alcimus, and the Hasideans suffer. 47. The mischievous activity of Alcimus. 48. The battle of Capharsalama. 49. The victory of Adasa and "Nicanor's Day." 50. Judas appeals to Rome. 51. An alliance formed and Syria warned. 52. The defeat and death of Judas. 53. The Hellenists triumph for a while; Jonathan chosen leader of the nation. 54. Jonathan repulses Bacchides. 55. Alcimus again shows his

Hellenistic aims. 56. The Hellenists conspire against Jonathan, who affects an alliance with Bacchides. 57. Jonathan makes Michmash his capital and cements his power.

V

THE ATTAINMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

SECTIONS 58-71. PAGES 58-71

SECTION 58. A court comedy in Syria in which Jonathan has a part. 59. Jonathan's splendid gains from rivalries in Syria. 60. Jonathan defeats Apollonius near Jamnia. 61. Demetrius II. becomes King of Syria. 62. Jonathan obtains more territory and privileges. 63. Jonathan's proof of friendship to Demetrius. 64. Antiochus, son of Alexander, wins the support of Jonathan, who afterward defeats Demetrius. 65. Jonathan renews friendship with Rome and Sparta. 66. The land is guarded against Demetrius. 67. The citadel cut off by a wall. 68. Tryphon's treachery and Jonathan's imprisonment. 69. Simon takes the leadership; Jonathan murdered. 70. The national situation at this time. 71. Judea gains political independence.

VI

JUDAISM IN SYRIA AND EGYPT

SECTIONS 72-88. PAGES 72-86

SECTION 72. The twofold relationship of the Jews in Antioch and Alexandria. 73. The flight of Onias to Egypt. 74. The temple near Leontopolis. 75. The relation of this temple to the temple in Jerusalem. 76. The real reason for building the temple in Egypt. 77. The true genius of Egyptian Judaism. 78. The two facts which help to explain the character of nearly all Græco-Jewish literature. 79. The acquaintance of the Jews with the literature of the Greeks. 80. The philosophic interest of the Alexandrian Jews. 81. The work of Aristobulus. 82. The general character of the Book of Wisdom. 83. Its great theme. 84. Wisdom in its relations to God. 85. The comprehensiveness of the term on its human side. 86. The teachings of the book about God and the life beyond. 87. The message of the Sibyl. 88. Outline of Book III. of Sibylline Oracles and the purpose of the book.

VII

THE HAPPY DAYS OF SIMON'S REIGN

SECTIONS 89-98. PAGES 87-96

SECTION 89. Simon's vigorous action in capturing Gazara, Bethsur, and the citadel in Jerusalem. 90. Changes attendant upon the capture of the citadel and Simon's successful administration of affairs. 91. His encouragement of commerce and agriculture. 92. The unparalleled honor given him by the people. 93. Renewed alliance with Rome; its value. 94. Simon's coinage of money. 95. Fresh troubles in Syria, in which Simon becomes involved. 96. Jonathan and Judas, sons of Simon, defeat a Syrian army. 97. The treacherous murder of Simon and his sons. 98. The record of First Maccabees.

VIII

TERRITORIAL EXPANSION UNDER JOHN HYRCANUS

SECTIONS 99-105. PAGES 97-104

SECTION 99. John Hyrcanus, Simon's son, becomes leader and seeks to avenge the murder of his father. 100. Antiochus Sidetes besieges Hyrcanus in Jerusalem, but concludes a treaty of peace. 101. The probable influence of Rome. 102. The changes in Syrian affairs give Hyrcanus opportunity to establish himself in power. 103. He engages foreign troops, makes several successful expeditions, and destroys the Samaritan temple. 104. Compels the Idumeans to be circumcised. 105. He lays siege to Samaria and carries the northern boundary of the kingdom to Carmel and Scythopolis.

IX

INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND THE GROWTH OF PARTIES

SECTIONS 106-117. PAGES 105-116

SECTION 106. The effect of territorial expansion upon the varied interests of the nation. 107. The party of the Pharisees. 108. Their doctrine of Providence. 109. Their doctrine of the future life. 110. The party of the Sadducees. 111. Their doctrines of Providence and of the future life. 112. The effect

of their creed upon their political activity. 113. The Essenes. 114. The origin of the peculiar teachings promulgated by them. 115. The breach of Hyrcanus with the Pharisees. 116. The method by which he opposed them. 117. The general character of his administration.

X

THE REVIVAL OF HELLENISM AND THE STRUGGLE OF PARTIES

SECTIONS 118-130. PAGES 117-126

SECTION 118. The leading question of the time. 119. Aristobulus, the son of Hyrcanus, usurps the rulership and favors anti-Pharisaic tendencies. 120. His brief reign of one year ended by a fatal illness. 121. He is succeeded by the infamous Alexander Jannæus. 122. His unsuccessful wars by which all the gains of the past were imperilled. 123. The timely interference of Cleopatra. 124. Successful expeditions to the east of the Jordan and into Philistia. 125. Jannæus insults the people at the Feast of Tabernacles, and a terrible massacre follows. 126. The Pharisees stir up rebellion against him; civil war for six years. 127. Jannæus is defeated at Shechem and becomes relentless against the Pharisees. 128. He becomes involved in Syrian troubles. 129. A period of successful campaigns is followed by his death in 78 B.C. 130. The results of his reign.

XI

FATAL DISSENSIONS AND THE COMING OF THE ROMANS

SECTIONS 131-146. PAGES 127-139

SECTION 131. Alexandra and the Pharisees. 132. How the interests of the law were furthered. 133. The revengeful spirit of the Pharisees. 134. Threatened invasion of Tigranes of Armenia. 135. Aristobulus and the Sadducees get possession of strongholds. 136. Alexandra dies. 137. Aristobulus compels Hyrcanus II., the rightful successor, to give him the rulership, and the Pharisees are ignored. 138. Antipater, the Idumean, interferes, and Aristobulus is besieged upon the temple mount. 139. Scaurus, the Roman general, sides with

Aristobulus. 140. Hyrcanus, Aristobulus, and the people make appeal to Pompey. 141. Pompey, being resisted by Aristobulus, resolves to take the city by force. 142. Aristobulus seizes the temple mount, but is finally overcome by the Romans. 143. The administrative changes which made void the work of years. 144. The estimate of it all by the Pharisees. 145. The Psalms of Solomon; their teaching regarding the Messiah. 146. Their teaching about the resurrection and immortality of the righteous.

PART II

THE ROMAN PERIOD OF JEWISH HISTORY

I

THE HISTORICAL SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD

SECTIONS 147-159. PAGES 143-153

SECTION 147. The limits of the period. 148. The sources of information. 149. The value of Josephus for this period. 150. The twofold value of the New Testament witness. 151. Rabbinical literature. 152. The Mishna, Talmuds, Midrashim, and Targums. 153. What may be learned from these Jewish works. 154. Sources of knowledge from the Roman side of the relations of Rome to Judea. 155. The two lines of development in the mental life of the nation. 156. The Psalms of Solomon. 157. The Assumption of Moses,—the voice of conservative Phariseeism. 158. The Book of Jubilees. 159. Later works which reveal the methods and hope of Judaism.

II

THE TROUBLOUS TIMES OF HYRCANUS II.

SECTIONS 160-178. PAGES 154-169

SECTION 160. The Jews in Rome and the attitude of the people in Judea. 161. The real value of Pompey's conquest of Judea and his policy. 162. The manner of acceptance of the conquest by the Pharisees, the people and the Hellenistic centres. 163. The first manifestation of national discontent. 164. The

policy of Gabinius, the proconsul of Syria. 165. The revolution under Aristobulus I. 166. The uprising under Alexander and the increased power of Antipater. 167. The new Triumvirate in Rome, Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus; how it affected Judea. 168. The civil wars in Rome; Cæsar crosses the Rubicon. 169. Aristobulus poisoned. 170. Pompey defeated at Pharsalia; Cæsar supports Cleopatra and gains mastery of Alexandria. 171. Antipater's substantial support of Cæsar. 172. Changes brought about in Judea through Antipater's friendship to Cæsar. 173. Antipater's bold assumption of authority. 174. Herod's policy in Galilee; he is summoned to Jerusalem for trial. 175. The political confusion consequent upon the assassination of Cæsar. 176. Mark Antony's policy and Herod's gain from promptly following it. 177. Antipater poisoned; estimate of his character and work. 178. Changes in the Roman sovereignty and the results in Judea.

III

THE LAST OF THE HASMONEANS

SECTIONS 179-189. PAGES 170-178

SECTION 179. The Parthian invasion of Syria in 41 B.C. 180. Antigonus uses the occasion to regain the throne. 181. Herod, learning of the death of Phasaël, flies for safety to Masada. 182. Antigonus master of the situation, but unable to maintain himself. 183. Herod seeks out Antony, and while in Rome is appointed King of the Jews. 184. He lands at Ptolemais in 39 B.C., and conquers Galilee and Joppa. 185. He advances upon Jerusalem, but is poorly supported by the Romans. 186. He makes direct appeal to Antony. 187. He meets reverses, but still resolutely pushes forward his cause. 188. He marries Mariamne. 189. With the help of Sosius, Herod besieges and captures Jerusalem; Antigonus beheaded.

IV

HEROD, THE KING OF THE JEWS

SECTIONS 190-205. PAGES 179-190

SECTION 190. The sharp contrasts in Herod's character and their reflection in the life of Jerusalem. 191. The two guiding principles of his whole career. 192. The initial acts of his actual

kingship. 193. He appoints Ananel high-priest and closely watches Hyrcanus. 194. Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, secures by diplomacy the appointment of her son, Aristobulus III., as high-priest. 195. Aristobulus murdered at Jericho. 196. Herod is summoned before Antony. 197. Herod gains the favor of Antony. 198. Salome arouses suspicions of Herod against Mariamne. 199. Cleopatra is given all the cities south of the Eleutherus River. 200. Octavian denounces Antony before the Roman Senate. 201. In the battle of Actium, B.C. 31, Octavian becomes sole master of the Roman world; Herod at once supports him. 202. Herod gives substantial proof of his new allegiance. 203. Octavian accepts Herod as an ally. 204. Herod puts Mariamne to death. 205. Herod's terrible remorse, illness, and fury against Alexandra and the sons of Babas.

V

HEROD UNDER AUGUSTUS

SECTIONS 206-221. PAGES 191-202

SECTION 206. The tendency of the Roman world toward the issue reached in the supremacy of Augustus. 207. The double relationship of Herod's position. 208. The two large duties laid upon Herod by Augustus. 209. The tidal wave of Hellenism over Jerusalem. 210. Herod establishes fortresses. 211. His system of espionage. 212. The better side of Herod's purposes. 213. The supreme ambition of all his striving. 214. How his passion for building found expression. 215. His measures to develop the business of the country. 216. The great harbor at Cæsarea. 217. The Hellenizing influences about his court. 218. His proposition to build a new temple and the probable motive actuating him. 219. The manner and the time of the work upon this temple. 220. The general character of it and Judaism's appropriation of it. 221. The insult of the golden eagle.

VI

IN THE DAYS OF HEROD THE KING

SECTIONS 222-234. PAGES 203-214

SECTION 222. The glory of Herod's reign and the one significant impossibility in it. 223. The education of Herod's sons and their reception in Judea. 224. The visit of Agrippa, the com-

missioner of Augustus, to Judea. 225. Herod's domestic troubles. 226. The dark treachery of Antipater, Herod's son by Doris, his first wife. 227. Herod's quarrel with Syllæus and his rescue from disgrace by Nicolas of Damascus. 228. The mischievous Lacedæmonian, Eurycles, who compasses the death of Herod's sons, Aristobulus and Alexander. 229. The continual treachery of Antipater. 230. Herod discovers the true character of Antipater. 231. The young man is summoned from Rome, tried, and put to death. 232. Herod's illness, the report of his death, and the consequent activity in removing profanations from the land. 233. His determination to make the land mourn at the time of his death. 234. The Babe in the manger in Bethlehem.

VII

THE INNER LIFE OF THE NATION

SECTIONS 235-256. PAGES 215-231

SECTION 235. The characteristics by which we can estimate the nation's inner life. 236. The antagonisms which reveal its power. 237. The foundation of faith laid in childhood. 238. The only education for the mass of Jewish boys. 239. The true school of the nation. 240. The officials and order of service in the synagogue. 241. The synagogue and the scribes. 242. The scribes and their threefold task. 243. The bearing of the law upon life; the Halacha and Haggada. 244. The Halacha, the complete expression of Judaism; two much-discussed themes in the Mishna. 245. The golden days of scribism. 246. The administrative functions of the scribes. 247. The honor which they received and the spirit they cherished. 248. The result of their labors in the life of the nation. 249. The bearing of scribal teaching upon the temple worship. 250. The character of the higher classes of priests; the two forces devitalizing the worship of the Holy Place. 251. The hope of the nation in the Messiah. 252. The Messiah of the second part of the Book of Enoch; of the fourth part; of the Psalms of Solomon. 253. The only way to bring the glorious day of the Messiah's presence. 254. The Messianic hope in Alexandrian literature. 255. The teachings which intensified the charm of this hope. 256. The nation and its hopes.

VIII

HEROD'S SONS AND KING AGRIPPA

SECTIONS 257-275. PAGES 232-245

SECTION 257. The provisions of Herod's will. 258. The desperate beginning of Archelaus in Judea. 259. Varus sent from Antioch to quell rebellion; the robbery of the temple by Sabinus. 260. The rapid spread of revolt in the land. 261. The settlement of Herod's will. 262. The sad condition of affairs facing Antipas and Archelaus upon their return from Rome. 263. The short and tyrannical rule of Archelaus. 264. The character of Antipas and the price he paid for royal favor. 265. Some of the notable public buildings erected by Antipas. 266. His amour with Herodias and its consequences. 267. He is defeated by Aretas. 268. The accession of Caligula and Herod's banishment to Gaul. 269. The character of Philip and his successful reign. 270. Agrippa's early career. 271. Agrippa receives favors from Caligula, who soon after causes widespread trouble by his insanity. 272. After Caligula's assassination, Agrippa helps Claudius to the throne. 273. The value of Agrippa's short reign to Judaism. 274. His politic course of procedure. 275. His sudden death at Cæsarea.

IX

IN THE HANDS OF ROME

SECTIONS 276-290. PAGES 246-257

SECTION 276. The earnest but mistaken desire of the people to be added to the province of Syria. 277. The arrangement of Roman provinces under Augustus, and their respective methods of government. 278. The census under Quirinius and the opposition to it. 279. The formation of the party of the Zealots. 280. The collectors of custom in Palestine. 281. The Sanhedrin, — its members, power, and jurisdiction. 282. The character and policy of Pontius Pilate. 283. The quiet, intermediate reign of Agrippa I. followed by the government by procurators. 284. The procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus. 285. The change of policy by Claudius in the appointment of Tiberius Alexander, as procurator. 286. The increasing turbulence of the Zealots during the procuratorship of Cumanus.

287. The severity and cruelty of Felix call out the Sicarii; disorder increases rapidly. 288. Festus deals with a virtual state of anarchy. 289. The desperate situation while Albinus is procurator. 290. Gessius Florus exhausts the patience of the nation; it is ready to plunge into open, determined rebellion.

X

THE FINAL CATASTROPHE

SECTIONS 291-317. PAGES 260-277

SECTION 291. The refusal to offer the daily sacrifice for the emperor — a declaration of war. 292. The treacherous deeds of Florus and their results. 293. His deliberate plans to expose the people to fatal risk. 294. The attempt of Agrippa II. to persuade the people to give up all thoughts of rebellion. 295. The seizure of Masada by the Jews; the endeavor of the Pharisees to avert the war. 296. Agrippa accepts invitation of Pharisees to send an army to Jerusalem; the insurgents victorious and destructive. 297. Rapid progress of the revolutionists, yet not without divisions among themselves. 298. Cestius Gallus interferes and is badly defeated by the Jews. 299. Active preparations made by Romans and revolutionists for a determined war. 300. The work of preparation under Josephus in Galilee; his conflicts with the Zealots. 301. Vespasian marches unhindered into Galilee. 302. The terrible siege of Jotapata. 303. Tiberias and Tarichæa submit to the Romans. 304. Gamala, Itabryrium, and Gischala are also subdued. 305. Nero dies, and Vespasian, being chosen emperor, hands over to Titus the siege of Jerusalem. 306. Civil war in Jerusalem. 307. The Zealots treacherously secure the help of the Idumeans. 308. The reign of terror continues in Jerusalem. 309. Simon, an outlaw, invited by the Moderate party into the city; the city torn by factions. 310. The coming of the Romans. 311. The long siege and the advance of the Romans within the second wall. 312. The capture of the third wall and the fortress of Antonia. 313. The temple enclosure seized and the temple burned. 314. The capture of the upper city. 315. The fortresses of Herodium and Machærus surrender; the desperate resistance and final self-murder of the garrison at Masada. 316. The Jewish state a thing of the past; the survival of Judaism. 317. The great triumph in Rome and the arch of Titus.

XI

GLIMPSES OF JUDAISM IN PALESTINE AFTER THE WAR
AND OF JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION


SECTIONS 318-333. PAGES 278-286

SECTION 318. The unshaken faith of Judaism and the lesson from its calamity. 319. The new centre at Jamnia. 320. The policy of the Romans after the war. 321. The task of Judaism. 322. The rapid recuperation of the land in population. 323. The outrage of Hadrian and the blind folly of the nation. 324. The outcome of this second awful crisis. 325. The spirit of the Judaism of the Dispersion. 326. The importance of the Synagogue in the Dispersion. 327. Philo Judæus and his mission. 328. The fidelity of Alexandrian Judaism to the great principles of faith. 329. The policy of the Roman emperors toward the Jews of the Dispersion. 330. The Dispersion really a contradiction within the Empire. 331. The proselyting spirit of the Dispersion. 332. The twofold interest of the Jews thus scattered abroad. 333. The terrible outbreak under Trajan and its issue.

APPENDIX I. The Seleucidæ	289
APPENDIX II. The Genealogy of the Hasmoneans	290
APPENDIX III. The House of the Herods	291
APPENDIX IV. Outline of Walls about Jerusalem in 70 A.D.	292
APPENDIX V. Are there Maccabean Psalms?	293-296
APPENDIX VI. Books of Reference upon Jewish History	297-301
BOOKS OF REFERENCE	302-303
REFERENCES	304-308
INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS	311-317
INDEX OF REFERENCES TO BIBLICAL AND EXTRA- BIBLICAL SOURCES	318-320


LIST OF MAPS

CHRONOLOGICAL CHART	Frontispiece
MAP OF PALESTINE CONTAINING PLACES FOR MACCABEAN PERIOD	to face page 32
MAP OF PALESTINE CONTAINING PLACES FOR ROMAN PERIOD	to face page 173
THE HELLENISTIC WORLD ABOUT THE CEN- TRAL AND EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN . .	to face page 289



PART I

THE MACCABEAN PERIOD OF JEWISH
HISTORY



I

THE HISTORICAL SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD

1. THE Maccabean period of the history of the Jews is named from Judas Maccabeus, the first and most illustrious chieftain of that family of Jewish patriots who led the religious revolt in Judea against Antiochus Epiphanes, and who secured for their people religious and political freedom. The beginning of the period, therefore, was coincident with the opening of the struggle in 168 B. C.; its close was in 63 B. C., when the Romans took control in Palestine. The tide of Greek influences which Alexander and his successors brought upon the land of Israel met with earnest opposition on the part of many in the Jewish nation. For a long time before the actual issue came, that opposition could have been quickly crystallized into open and unyielding resistance. The decisive moment, however, was in 168 B. C., when Mattathias, with the war-cry of "Zeal for the Law," summoned the faithful to stand with him against the Syrians. Brilliant successes carried the movement forward within three years to the completion of its first stage of progress in the rededication of the temple in 165 B. C. Then with political, as well as religious aims, the struggle continued until 142 B. C., when Judea achieved political independence. The whole

4 THE MACCABEAN PERIOD OF JEWISH HISTORY

period, therefore, can be conveniently divided into three parts, — that of gathering power and brilliant aggression, 168–165 B. C.; that of religious freedom, 162–142 B. C.; that of religious freedom and political independence, 142–63 B. C.

2. The main sources of information regarding this period are the First and Second Books of Maccabees and Josephus. Of these only Josephus gives a connected history of the whole period. Back of his work, as also back of the Books of Maccabees, lay sources known to us now only from the names of their authors, or from quotations and fragments which in different ways have been preserved. There was certainly no lack of historical interest in reference to this critical epoch. Supplementary information can be gleaned from the general histories of Greek writers, Polybius, Diodorus, and Appian; from rabbinic literature; from the literary products of the period itself; from the witness of coins, and from the rich results of archæological and geographical work in Palestine during the past thirty years.

3. The brief, vivid narrative of I. Maccabees begins with an account of the events which led to the Maccabean uprising and ends with the death of Simon. For the forty years (175–135 B. C.) which its history covers, it is an invaluable source of knowledge. Its simple, straightforward style, its generally trustworthy statements and its attention to details, reveal the true historian. From its reference to the Romans as friends, and to the history of John Hyrcanus, the date of its writing may be fixed at some time in the early part of the first century B. C. Its clear, definite acquaintance with events at such a remove from the

time of writing presupposes existing written sources. The writer is a Palestinian Jew, whose point of view is that of orthodox Judaism, and yet it is notable how little the author, despite all the trust in Providence which breathes through the book, seeks to explain events by other than natural causes. In this respect the work is the direct opposite of II. Maccabees, which shows a marked predilection for the marvellous. Nor is this the only difference between these two records of Maccabean history. It seems to be the aim of the writer of the First Book to let events speak for themselves, and to find in the simple recital of noble deeds the best teaching of religious devotion. The author of the Second Book, on the contrary, keeps continually before his reader the religious bearing and value of the history.

4. The Second Book begins with the attack upon the temple by Heliodorus, the minister of the Syrian monarch Seleucus IV. (175 B. C.), and ends with the victory of Judas Maccabeus over Nicanor in 160 B. C. For the few years which preceded the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, it is our sole authority. Like the First Book, it is written from the point of view of orthodox Judaism and was dependent upon written sources. Indeed, with the exception of chapters i. and ii., it claims to be (ii. 24-32) an epitomization of a work written by Jason of Cyrene not long after 160 B. C. The chronological parallelism of the accounts of I. and II. Maccabees, through several successive years of the history, affords opportunity for an easy comparison of the characteristics of each narrative. Conspicuous among the characteristics in the Second Book is a display of rhetoric which is inconsistent

with sober and careful narration. If one may judge from those passages which are undoubtedly from the epitomizer (ii. 19-32; xv. 38-39), this rhetorical effect is not attributable to Jason. The writer gives the impression of having worked up his material. Hence with a copiousness of detail, which sometimes helpfully supplements the narrative of the First Book, there is an exaggeration and often an inaccuracy which make the whole work inferior. No indisputable date can be given for its origin; it probably was written at some time in the last half of the second century B. C. Its chief value as a source of information to the historian is in those facts where it is not directly at variance with the First Book, and where additional and not improbable material makes more complete the picture of times or events.

5. In the first six chapters of the first book of the Jewish War, Josephus gives a rapid review of the principal events of the Maccabean period. The whole book is simply an introduction to the account of the war against the Romans in A. D. 66-70, hence is comparatively meagre and sketchy as a history. In his Antiquities, he has given two entire books (xii., xiii.) to the time between the troubles under Antiochus Epiphanes and those under Pompey. This narrative is based upon various sources. For the period 175-135 B. C. he relies principally upon I. Maccabees, supplementing his material from Polybius and other general historical works of the Greeks. For the rest of the Maccabean period his chief authorities are Strabo and Nicolas of Damascus, whose histories unfortunately are lost. He also uses Jewish oral tradition, but its contribution is of comparatively

little value. Josephus shared, with many of his countrymen at home and abroad, the anxious desire to commend his nation to powerful and cultured foreigners. The desire was both a stimulus and a temptation. It impelled him to write out in full the history of his people from the beginning; it led him to color fact with the light of romance, or modify it by adaptations which would harmonize it with Greek or Roman prejudices. This is noticeable, as far as the Maccabean period is concerned, in his account of the religious parties and in his silence about the Messianic hope, and these are but prominent instances of an unfaithfulness to fact, which appears whenever circumstances tempted him to an emphatic expression of his desire. The Antiquities, however, will always continue to be the fullest record of Jewish history. It is unfortunate that his Jewish War has not given us a more detailed account of the times of the Maccabees, for this work as a history is superior to the Antiquities. Out of these three sources, I. Maccabees, the Antiquities, and the Jewish War, it is possible, however, with the help of the remarkable results of archæological and geographical study, to make a clear, definite picture of a brilliant, heroic period of Jewish history.

6. The spirit of that picture breathes in the literature which was the outcome of the struggles and hopes of those days of unrest. Much of this literature is known only by name, but some great typical productions have been preserved. Among these stand pre-eminent, Daniel and the Book of Enoch. The question of the date of the Book of Daniel is beset with difficulties. That theory, however, of the time

of its origin which covers the greatest number of facts involved has just claim to acceptance; hence the generally received view that it belongs in the second century before Christ rather than in the sixth. The point of view of the author; the way the history, in predictive form, becomes specific in its details as it approaches the times of persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes; the theology of the book and its position in the latest group of the Hebrew canon, all bear witness to its later origin. It is the great prototype of that apocalyptic literature which, as best it could, was henceforth to play the prophet's part in comforting, inspiring, and guiding the nation. It is the model for all succeeding apocalypses. Antiochus is the little horn of the eighth chapter, and chapter xi. 21-45 describes his reign. In those dark days, when the life of the nation was threatened, new inspiration to fidelity and new hope of triumph were brought to the brave struggling patriots by the heroic faithfulness of Daniel and the Hebrew children. God was "watching above his own," and the days through which they were passing might issue in the glory of the Messianic Kingdom. This was the message of the Book of Daniel to the Maccabean leaders and their followers. From the first it seems to have been received with earnest welcome. While, thus considered, the book contributes to our knowledge of the closing years of the Greek period, it is not necessary to conclude that its stories are entirely without basis in fact, and that Daniel is himself a myth. The stories are homilies rather than histories. They give us, in all probability, features of a traditional story of Daniel, moulded to the purpose of the author. Similarly the prophetic visions all quicken

the expectation of the solution of the desperate troubles of the nation in the Messiah's coming. Courage and hope are the watchwords of the book. The probable date is not earlier than 167 B. C., and not later than the beginning of 165 B. C.

7. The Book of Enoch is a representative of a voluminous literature now lost which once circulated under the name of this ancient saint. From the fact that the book in its component parts reflects the thoughts and hopes of different periods from 170 B. C. to the early part of the first century before Christ, it becomes a fruitful source of knowledge for the inner life of the nation. In the form of visions and predictions clothed in strange and often fantastic symbolism, it speaks its message of comfort and inspiration to the troubled yet valiant spirits of the Maccabean era. It aims, in common with all apocalyptic literature, to show that despite the suffering and distress of the faithful, God's righteousness shall yet be vindicated. Hence it sketches in outline and under peculiar imagery the history of mankind, and in its prophecy of the future, opens up not only the issues of the Messiah's advent, but the destinies of eternity. The book is rich in doctrinal teaching regarding Messianic times and the future life. Of the five parts into which the whole may be divided, that including chapters lxxxiii. to xc. resembles the apocalypse of Daniel in its point of view, while the portion xxxvii. to lxxii., containing the Similitudes, is perhaps the most important of all. Its exalted conceptions of the Messiah and of the Messianic kingdom are unique. The respective dates of these two sections are probably about 165 B. C., and some time between 94 and 64 B. C. It

was no obstacle to the power and influence of these prophecies that they came under an assumed name. Their quickening hopes nerved men both to dare and to endure.

8. While Judaism in Palestine was thus summoning her defenders to fidelity, and in the visions of the prophet enlarging and defining her hopes for the future, Alexandrian Judaism was engaged in earnestly commending her faith to the Gentiles. Along lines that converge in the work and word of the Master, each was preparing the world for the fulness of times. In Egypt, the reflective rather than the martial mood predominates, and the literature which we know, either through the testimony of others, or through actual possession of it, glorifies the beliefs and hopes of "the chosen people." The fragments of Aristobulus preserved by Eusebius show the beginnings of the philosophic harmonization of the conceptions of the Jew with the thoughts of the Greek, which, despite all its concessions and adaptations, yet saved the essentials of the Jewish faith, and prepared the way for a really higher and more spiritual presentation of them in later times. If in the exaggeration of Jewish pride Moses was made by Aristobulus and other Jewish philosophers to be the teacher of the Greeks, it was because they believed he had some great truths to teach which could not be gained elsewhere. Out of all the moulding and remoulding of religious conceptions, which the contact of revelation and philosophy in Alexandria thus brought about, came some products which appear in our New Testament.

9. At the same time, when this method of extol-

ling and interpreting the law was in progress, voices were heard commending to the thoughtful among the heathen the worth and beauty of Wisdom. A fine specimen of this Alexandrian teaching is given us in the Wisdom of Solomon, whose exact date is uncertain. The two limits within which it must be placed are the date of the translation of the Septuagint on the one side, and the age of Philo on the other. If the allusion to present sufferings and chastisement in xii. 22-23 is to the persecutions under Ptolemy VII., the date can be determined a little more definitely and may have been about 140 B. C. It is not important, however, to know the exact date. Its deep interest as a source for this period of Alexandrian Judaism is in its revelation of the noble spirit which confronted the idolatry and corruption of Egypt, in its clear insight into the necessity and worth of the essentials of righteousness, and in its exalted view of the divine aspect of Wisdom. The influences of the Greek surroundings of its author are traceable in the book, but he, nevertheless, occupies the point of view of orthodox Judaism. "The stuff is still Hebrew, but shot, as it were, with hues reflecting the light of western speculation." The work may be conveniently divided into two great parts, — chapters i. to ix., and x. to xix. The latter is devoted to the historic illustration of the principles and injunctions set forth in the first half of the work. In accord with the custom of the time, the whole is attributed, with obvious fitness, to Solomon.

10. If the names of Hebrew prophets and sages could be used to commend Jewish teaching to heathen readers, it was an easy advance to the belief that a

suitable name from heathenism itself might even more successfully win attention. Hence the Sibylline Oracles. The sibyl in the ancient world was an embodiment of prophetic power; the one who declared the will of the gods concerning the fate of cities and kingdoms. The number of these sibyls varied at different times, but there were at least three of wide renown. Written records of their oracles were in circulation and were held in the highest esteem. Therefore, as Schürer remarks, "it was a happy hit when Jewish propaganda took possession of this form to turn it into account for its own purposes." The use of it began in Alexandria in the second century B. C., and proved so serviceable that the early Christian Church continued it in her own interests. Of the large collection of these oracles, Jewish and Christian, which has been preserved, the third book is of especial interest to the student of the Maccabean period. It originated probably about 140 B. C. With the exception of lines 1-96, which are out of place, the remainder of the book, in apocalyptic style, sketches the history of the world to the time of the Romans, and then, in lines 162-195, passes over into prophecy concerning the future of Israel and the blessings of Messianic times (652-817). Interspersed through various parts of the whole are the announcements of judgments and calamities upon various heathen nations (295-333, 381-572). In view of the solemn issues which she thus foretells, the Sibyl appeals to all mortals to abandon idolatry and to worship the one true God. When the happy time should come in which the glorious hopes of Judaism should be realized, he who had been faithful to the God of Israel should enter into all the

promised blessedness. The Sibyl's message was not in vain. Never had she spoken with greater solemnity, nor with richer consolation, and her words reached many to whom the Wisdom of Solomon, or the philosophizings of Aristobulus, would be unknown.

II

THE CAUSES AND OCCASION OF THE MACCABEAN UPRISING

11. THE Maccabean period of Jewish history is in reality the period of the intense struggle for supremacy of two spiritual forces, — Hellenism and Judaism. About this issue centred leaders, parties, battles, and all changes in government, society, and religion. It is significant, therefore, that the First Book of Maccabees, our best source of knowledge regarding these troublous times, begins its narrative with the sketch of the career of Alexander the Great, passing thence to Antiochus Epiphanes, the other great champion of Hellenism and the sworn foe of Judaism. These two names, as far as Judea was concerned, represent that long process of development which reached its culmination in the days of Judas Maccabeus. Every school-boy is familiar with the picture of Alexander weeping for more worlds to conquer. His genius as a soldier has rightly won admiration; but the greatness of the man is more clearly seen in the exalted ambition which he set before himself of carrying Greek culture into all lands he could subdue. He sought that fusion of nationalities which should be expressed not only in unity of government, but also in unity of language, customs, and civilization. He followed up his conquests by colonization, and when

he died, his successors carried out his purpose until all about the eastern Mediterranean Hellenistic influences were dominant. Schürer reminds us of the difference between Hellenic and Hellenistic culture, — the latter being more complex and comprehensive in that it took to itself the “available elements of all foreign cultures;” but it never lost the prevailing impress of the Greek mind. Its very comprehensiveness helped on its advance. It had much to offer, especially to those who were, for any reason, aside from the great currents of the world’s life; but it also made imperious claims, being satisfied with nothing less than the adaptation of religion itself to its own modes of thought.

12. This force which had powerfully affected the Jews in Egypt had established itself along the coast and all about the northern and eastern sides of Palestine. Indeed, it was asserting itself in Jerusalem, and had not Antiochus Epiphanes forced an issue, it might there also have ultimately moulded all forms of life. To what extent it had already prevailed may be seen in the fact that Jason, the leader of the Hellenists, had persuaded Antiochus by large gifts to depose Onias III. and to give to him the office of high-priest with the right to erect a gymnasium in Jerusalem. This he did, and not only did the young men show their fondness for this Grecian privilege, but the priests themselves, “neglecting the sacrifices, hastened to be partakers in the unlawful representation in the palaestra” (II. Mac. iv. 7-15; I. Mac. i. 13-14). Naturally they were ashamed of the indubitable mark of their nationality when they appeared in the arena, and consequently they sought to efface all traces of circumci-

sion (I. Mac. i. 15). A spirit that could go so far in "falling away from the holy covenant and yoking itself with the heathen" sought eagerly in every possible way to show its "broad-mindedness." Jewish costumes and names were exchanged for Greek, and many, that they might enjoy in full measure these foreign privileges, had themselves enrolled as "citizens of Antioch" (II. Mac. iv. 9). Along this way of apostasy was the possibility of wealth and political preferment; hence with ambitions for power which would use for its own purposes the highest sacred offices; with wealth and social prestige, which were made the means of realizing these ambitions, and with promises and pleasures that were unquestionably attractive, Hellenism sought for the mastery of Judea.

13. Over against it stood the firm, uncompromising spirit of Judaism, whose reverence for the law was its distinguishing mark. When the exile was over, and amid the holy associations of Jerusalem the national life and worship began anew, there were no more temptations to the idolatry of the olden days. "Separation from all that was heathen was from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the very vital nerve of Jewish piety." That separation was secured by the law. There was no concern of life too small to elude its direction. By its precepts and their careful application, the way to holiness was made plain and explicit. The whole trend of the development was toward the outward and the formal. It begat a new idolatry, — that of the letter and of mechanical observance. But it held the people to an unbounded zeal for that "which had been delivered to them by Moses" and

expanded by the teachers of these later days. The scribes were the representative leaders of the nation. Schools for the instruction of the young were established in Jerusalem and elsewhere, and he alone was accounted "learned" who had at command, not only the great teachings of the Mosaic law itself, but also the mass of explanations and decisions that through the years had accumulated in the teachings of the scribes. Men would die rather than violate the commands of the law (I. Mac. ii. 34).

14. All this fidelity and scrupulousness were counted as commendable in the sight of heaven. Pride kept pace with fidelity. The severity of their demands became an inspiration to hold fast to the traditions, and to glorify the power that produced them. Political ambitions were, to those who kept alive this zeal, entirely subordinate to the one main purpose of life, the maintenance of religious ideals. Piety, defined by such interpretations as were making it increasingly a matter of definite routine, was the most vital concern. With the progress of Hellenization, advanced this Puritanic, legalistic spirit, which could in later days declare that "the law must be fulfilled even if Israel be ruined by it." Around the temple worship in Jerusalem and in the synagogues the land over, Judaism fed its hopes, cherished its ideals, and strengthened its resistance, as far as it could, against all external influences seeking to mould or to destroy the faith which was its peculiar glory. In all the complex and often tragic history which lies before us, these two underlying, antagonistic forces — Hellenism and Jewish legalism — are constantly at work. They are the real causes of all the perplexing complications which

the historian of the two centuries of Jewish history before Christ's coming must set forth.

15. At the close of the Greek Period (175-165 B. C.; see Kent, *History Jewish People*, Vol. III.), Antiochus Epiphanes was on the throne of Syria. His training while a hostage for fourteen years in Rome, his reckless, passionate nature, and his determined espousal of everything Greek made him from the first a man to be feared. His ambition to Hellenize his whole kingdom met with the hearty support of the Greek party in Judea. Jason, the leader of this party, and the brother of the faithful high-priest Onias III., asked for the high-priest's office, and with the help of a goodly sum of gold obtained it (II. Mac. iv. 7-10). It was a position of great power for good or for evil, for since the days of Ezra it had grown in importance, becoming political as well as religious in character. The high-priest was virtually the head of the nation. He was the representative of the old order and in the normal progress of affairs held his office for life. Jason wished the place in order to gratify personal ambitions and to carry out the schemes of the party which he represented, for "he forthwith led his fellow-countrymen over to the Greek fashion" (II. Mac. iv. 10). Jerusalem for the first time saw the strange doings of the gymnasium, and was called upon to send money to the sacrificial festival of Hercules at Tyre. All this pleased Antiochus, and the process of Hellenization must have seemed to him to be making most satisfactory progress, when upon the occasion of a visit shortly afterward to Jerusalem he was escorted into the city "with torchlights and with great shoutings" (II. Mac. iv. 22).

16. In 171 B. C. came Jason's turn to be set aside. A certain Menelaus whom Jason had sent to Antioch on business at court, offered the king three hundred talents more than Jason was giving, and was consequently appointed high-priest. The statement that he brought to it nothing worthy the high-priesthood (II. Mac. iv. 25) is hardly necessary, for it is easily read in the career whose very beginning gave promise of all its treachery and baseness. Most of the people took the side of Jason (Ant. xii. 5, 1); but without success. He was driven into exile, and Menelaus turned his attention to getting the money which he had promised Antiochus. He had, however, bargained for too large a sum. He could not procure it by the usual method of taxation, and so helped himself from the temple treasures. There was no quicker way to arouse the passion of the people. Onias III. rebuked the dastardly act and paid for his fidelity with his life, or, as Wellhausen, distrusting the story in II. Maccabees, maintains, fled to Egypt (see J. W. i. 1). The people killed Lysimachus, the agent of Menelaus, near the treasury, and sent a deputation to Antiochus to prefer charges against the unprincipled high-priest. The latter, though convicted, saved himself by bribery, and secured the death of his accusers (II. Mac. iv. 42-47). The outlook for those who loved the law was dark indeed. Menelaus was more than ever the ready and effective tool of Antiochus.

17. In 172 B. C. Ptolemy VI. claimed Coele-Syria and Palestine as the dowry of his mother, Cleopatra, and when Epiphanes refused to give it up, invaded Syrian territory. This act resulted in a war between

Antiochus and his nephews. Our interest centres in the second Egyptian campaign made in 170 B. C., for the report of the king's death in Egypt led the exiled Jason to try and put himself again into the high-priest's office. He suddenly appeared at Jerusalem, captured the city, and shut up Menelaus in the citadel. It was, however, a short-lived victory, for Jason "slew" his own citizens without mercy, not thinking that "good success against kinsmen is the greatest ill success" (II. Mac. v. 6). He was obliged to go again into exile, where he died with none to mourn for him. His desperate deed, however, was fraught with fearful consequences to Jerusalem. Antiochus looked upon it as a revolt of Judea and "in furious mind" sought vengeance. The record in I. Maccabees i. 24, describes his conduct by the two words, "defilement" and "insolence," but the account in II. Maccabees does not seem exaggerated in declaring that men, women, and children were killed in wholesale fashion and thousands were sold into slavery. Nor was this all. Guided by Menelaus, the king insolently entered the temple, plundered its enormous treasures, and carried away to Antioch its valuable articles of furniture. Philip, a Phrygian, and a man more detestable, if possible, than Antiochus himself, was left in command of the city.

18. The worst was yet to come. In 168 B. C. Antiochus made another expedition to Egypt. He had in former campaigns been sufficiently successful to warrant him in believing that he could now make Egypt his own; but Rome had listened to the request of the Ptolemies for help, and a Roman envoy delivered to Antiochus a written order from the senate to

discontinue the war. Antiochus asked for time to consult with his friends before giving his answer. Popilius, the Roman legate, drew a circle in the sand with his staff round the Syrian king and said: "Before you step out of that circle you must decide." There was no alternative, and the schemes of Antiochus in Egypt were forever ended.

X 19. Frustrated and embittered, he again made the Jews the victims of his revenge. Josephus tells us (Ant. xii. 5, 4; Against Ap. ii. 7) that the reason of his attack upon Jerusalem was his need of money. Unquestionably this was so in part, but it was not the chief reason. The resistance of many to his heathenizing schemes kept alive his malignant hatred, and he now resolved that this determined "superstition" should be rooted out (I. Mac. i. 41). There must be no more observance of the Sabbath, no more offering of sacrifices to Jehovah, no more practising of the rite of circumcision. Every trace of Jewish worship and ceremonial must be done away with. Nor was the change to be merely negative. All Jews must adopt heathen practices (II. Mac. vi. 7, 9), and any one found with the book of the law in his possession was to be put to death (I. Mac. i. 41-50). As a program offering unlimited opportunity for terrible work in its execution, it was worthy of the ruler who made it.

20. At the head of an army of twenty-two thousand men, Apollonius, the Syrian general, came to Jerusalem. He professed peace, but waiting for a Sabbath in order to take the Jews unprepared, he began a merciless slaughter (II. Mac. v. 25, 26). The temple was dismantled and laid waste, and, that his revenues might be increased, women and children

were sold into slavery. The walls of the city were pulled down, and many houses looted and set on fire (I. Mac. i. 31, 32, 39; Ant. xii. 5, 4). All who could make their escape fled either to Egypt or to hiding-places in Judea, and strangers were brought in who would be in sympathy with Menelaus and the Syrians. Only one place was built up, — the citadel on Acra. This stronghold gave command of the temple enclosure and was for twenty-seven years a constant menace to the city until its capture by the Hasmonean Simon, in 141 B. C.

21. But the deepest insults of this awful time were worked out upon the temple mount. In December, 168 B. C., a pagan altar was built upon the site of the great altar of burnt offering, and dedicated to the Olympian Zeus. Soldiers and harlots revelled in the temple courts, and into them swine were driven and sacrificed and their polluting blood sprinkled upon the most holy places (II. Mac. vi. 2-4; Ant. xii. 5, 4). The people were compelled to take part in these heathen sacrifices, and overseers were appointed to make sure that the same conformity in worship existed in all parts of the land (I. Mac. i. 51). As many copies of the law or of other sacred writings as the soldiers could lay hands on were destroyed. Death was the certain penalty to any one who persisted in following the commands of the Jewish law. The only alternatives were conformity to pagan customs, or extermination. Menelaus had no small part in bringing all this about (Ant. xii. 9, 7). With the city in full possession of the Syrians and the Jews who followed him; with the faithful scattered into all parts of the land, he could congratulate Antiochus

on the successful issue of his work. It is not surprising that many Jews gave their allegiance in full to the heathen cult (I. Mac. i. 52). It was a day of sifting, but it was also a day of awakening. The mask of Hellenism was off. Its "broad-minded" culture was at heart false and really godless. With all that it had to offer in the way of material enlargement, its very atmosphere was filled with the miasma of moral death and corruption. So, at least, thought that band of faithful souls who, in the hiding-places of the mountains and desert, strengthened their zeal for the law and solemnly determined to die rather than renounce their faith (I. Mac. i. 62-64). In the destruction of their sacred books the Jews realized anew the priceless value of them all, and in this realization may be dated the impulse to add to the existing canon of the Law and the Prophets the third group of writings now included in our Old Testament.

22. Naturally such opposition kindled the hot anger of Antiochus. He resorted to all the devices which cruelty could invent to force his will upon the Jews. Josephus tells us (Ant. xii. 5, 4), that men were "whipped with rods, their limbs torn to pieces, and that they were fixed to crosses while alive and breathing;" and, as an example of what it would mean to defy the command forbidding circumcision, "certain women who had caused their children to be circumcised were paraded around the streets of Jerusalem, with their babes hanging at their breasts, and then thrown from a high wall and killed" (I. Mac. i. 60, 61; II. Mac. vi. 10). To this time also belong those stories told in the Second Book of Maccabees, which, whether true or not in all their details, reflect the

merciless spirit of the Hellenists. One is of Eleazar, the aged scribe, who refused to eat swine's flesh, and when urged to dissemble by buying flesh of his own procuring and substituting it for the sacrificial meat, declared that he must "leave a noble example to such as be young to die willingly and courageously for the honorable and holy laws," and then went unflinchingly to torture (II. Mac. vi. 18-31). The second story is of a mother and her seven sons, who died one after another under most excruciating suffering, which, in each case, seemed only to nerve the soul to heroic steadfastness of faith. It was with such spirits that Antiochus had now to deal. For a little while they waited as if stunned by the awful blow which had fallen upon the city and the temple. They even submitted at first to the cowardly artifice of the Syrians in taking the Sabbath to attack them (Ant. xii. 6, 2), and perished one thousand of them without resistance. Desperate, however, as it seemed, and contrary as it was to the long habit of submission, there was no other way of escaping a shameless and cruel death than to take the sword and look to the God of battles for success. But who should lead them?

23. Among the limestone hills of Judea, about twenty miles northwest of Jerusalem, lay the little town of Modein on a hill-slope one mile north from the old road which led from the capital to Lydda, by the stony way of Beth-horon. It was a place of no beauty in itself, but it commanded a wide prospect over the plain of Sharon and the "Great Sea." In this retired spot Mattathias, an aged priest of the order of Joarib, had his hereditary estates, and when the troubles

began at Jerusalem, he, with his five sons, retired thither mourning the terrible profanation of the holy city and temple and firm in their conviction that "it were better for them to die for the laws of their country than to live so ingloriously" as the conditions in Jerusalem demanded (I. Mac. ii. 1-14; Ant. xii. 6, 1). They had not been long in Modein when the officials of Antiochus appeared to carry out his will regarding heathen sacrifices. In the company that hastily gathered about the officers were Mattathias and his sons. An appeal was made to the venerable priest, as a man of influence, to set the example of compliance with the king's command. "You and your house shall then be in the number of the king's friends, and you and your children shall be honored with silver and gold and many gifts" (I. Mac. ii. 15-18). Many times had that promise been effective. "The king's friends," after this sort, were even then dwelling in Jerusalem and Samaria and throughout the land. Well the people knew what was involved in refusing this proffered friendship, but "he who had rent his clothes and put on sackcloth" because of the shame of Jerusalem had no ear for the temptations of an abhorred Hellenism. "If all the nations that are under the king's dominions obey him and fall away every one from the worship of their fathers, and give consent to his commandments; yet will I and my sons and my brethren walk in the covenant of our fathers. God forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances. We will not hearken to the king's words to go aside from our worship either to the right hand or to the left" (I. Mac. ii. 19-22). He had hardly ceased speaking when a Jew, either to

assert his Hellenizing sympathy, or to save the village from the wrath of the Syrians, stepped forward to make the detested sacrifice. Mattathias, in the fury of his indignation, was on the man in an instant and killed him. Then he turned upon the king's commissioner and, ere this man could defend himself, struck him down beside the altar, which was immediately pulled to pieces (I. Mac. ii. 24-26).

24. The deed of Mattathias was virtually the call to war. It was the uplifting of the standard of Judaism. In an unpremeditated moment one of the noblest and bravest struggles in all history for religious freedom had begun. Calling to all who were zealous for the law and the covenant to follow him, Mattathias and his sons fled across the central mountain ridge to the wilderness of Bethaven, above the Jordan valley. In this wild region they hid themselves in caves. The news of the bold deed at Modein found its way rapidly among the villages, and many "who sought after justice and judgment" deserted their homes, and hastily driving their cattle before them, also sought refuge in the wilderness (I. Mac. ii. 27-30). An army hastily sent out from Jerusalem was at first successful because of the unwillingness of the Jews to defend themselves on the Sabbath. Mattathias and his followers with greater wisdom determined to place necessity above even the rigid law governing the holy day, and agreed to fight whenever attacked (I. Mac. ii. 30-41).

25. With each fresh determination to resist, the zeal for the law seems to have been quickened. Recognizing in Mattathias a leader who had the courage of his convictions, the people gathered about him and

joined in an aggressive guerilla warfare, easily possible in the mountainous country about them. They made rapid descents upon the villages, not only pulling down the heathen altars, but also putting to death all apostate Jews whom they captured, and compelling the circumcision of all children in the households of these apostates. At times they were able to put to flight a company of Syrians. Success gave them hope and such confidence that they could boast that they "recovered the law out of the hand of the Gentiles and out of the hand of kings, and suffered not the sinner to triumph;" that is, they protected those who wished to observe the law and stood effectually in the way of the progress of Hellenizing influences.

26. Among those who rallied to the support of Matathias was "a company of Hasideans." The name is of more than passing interest, for it marks, at an earlier stage, that line of development which culminated in the Pharisees of later days, — the line of legalistic precision and exaction. We have already seen that the law was the sum and substance of post-exilic Judaism. The measure of one's earnestness in seeking to know and obey it was also the measure of his worth and honor among the people; and so the scribe became the man of authority and power. Zealous always for the maintenance of that which to him was so vital, he became doubly alert when the seductive influences of Hellenism were threatening to sap the very life of the nation. It was probably under the stress of the days of the madness of Antiochus that this party of "the pious" was formed. Its formation was an added emphasis upon that necessity of separation which was called for by fidelity to the law. Alas for

this whole trend in Israel's life! It made the emphasis more and more explicit until the outcome was the burdens and the bitterness of the Pharisaism of New Testament times. Whether or not Mattathias belonged to this new party is uncertain. He certainly expressed its spirit in his brave speech in Modein, and his whole conduct, as far as it can be studied, reveals that wisdom and strength which made him such a leader as these devoted patriots needed. The accession of the Hasideans brought the venerable priest-captain great strength and inspiration. The rebellion had now assumed proportions which required constant watchfulness and care. The leadership proved too much for the aged Mattathias. In 167 B. C. he died, after having served "the cause of the law" about a year, "and all Israel made great lamentation for him" (I. Mac. ii. 70). He was buried in Modein.

III

THE SUCCESSFUL STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

27. "If it was a piece of higher good fortune that the insurrection broke out undesignedly and was set on foot by a holy man of such blameless character, it was no less so that on his death he left behind him a heroic band of five sons, who all shared his principles and were ready to carry on the contest without an instant's delay" (Ewald). These five sons, John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar, and Jonathan, were known as the "Maccabees," from the surname of Judas, who was called Maccabeus, that is, "the hammerer," — though this interpretation, as well as every other, has been questioned, — and as the "Hasmoneans" from Hasmon, their grandfather. These Mattathias gathered about him just before his death, and in words which are outlined for us in I. Maccabees ii. 49-69, urged upon them courageous fidelity to the law. Simon, the second-born, because of his wisdom was commended by the father to the position of chief, and Judas, the third son, was named as their general. It is a notable characteristic of these five men that without jealousy they threw themselves into the earnest work committed to their hands. Judas at once assumed command and proved himself one of the greatest war-

riors ever known in Israel. In him the spirit of a Joshua lived again. He was, indeed, a "warrior of God." His exalted enthusiasm, sagacious methods, and vigorous, decisive action soon inspired his small army, enabling it to win victories which are little short of marvellous.

28. At first Judas followed the policy which his father had adopted. Making sudden sallies upon the outlying villages, or attacking them at night, he carried on a destructive, terrifying warfare. As Judea belonged under the supervision of Apollonius, the governor of Samaria, he advanced against Judas, who, watching his opportunity, fell upon the advancing force of Syrians and defeated them. Apollonius was slain and the sword of the Syrian general taken by Judas for his own use (I. Mac. iii. 10-12; Ant. xii. 7, 1). The news of the defeat soon found its way to the north, and Seron, the commander of the province of Coele-Syria, determined to put down the rebellion. In full confidence of an easy victory, Seron moved southward with a large army, and was met by Judas at Beth-horon, — a rough pass near Modein, leading from the plain to the central ridge, — and hopelessly defeated. As the Jews looked down upon the large force coming up toward them, the odds against them seemed too great, and they were anxious to withdraw. By a speech whose few sentences (see I. Mac. iii. 18-22) reveal the sure faith of Judas, the little army was inspirited, and with an impetuosity which carried all before it, the battle began. Seron fell, and, in the flight down into the plain, eight hundred of his troops. The rest escaped to the land of the Philistines (I. Mac. iii. 23, 24). Two such vic-

tories made the name of Judas famous and gave Antiochus reason for much uneasiness.

29. The Syrian king now determined that the Jews should be rooted out and Jerusalem utterly destroyed; but he himself could not go into Judea, for his treasury was empty, and money he must have, both to keep up his lavish giving and to pay his troops. He, accordingly, set out upon a predatory expedition against Parthia, and committed the task of punishing the Jews to Lysias, his governor-general, and the guardian of his son (I. Mac. iii. 31-33). To guard against any possibility of failure, great preparations were made against the small, resolute army of Judas. Forty thousand footmen and seven thousand horse were placed under the command of three experienced generals, — Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias. This force, with a detachment of elephants, made its way down the plain of Sharon, and turning up to the hills, encamped at Emmaus, about twenty miles northwest of Jerusalem. On this same route Richard Cœur de Lion long afterward led the English in their advance from Acre to Jerusalem. Judas gathered his forces at Mizpeh, sacred to the memory of Samuel's mighty intercession for Israel against the Philistines (I. Sam. vii. 5-13). From the summit of this mountain one has a wide outlook over the Judean hills, Jerusalem being easily visible. With humiliation and fasting, the people brought before the Lord the signs of their extremity, — the scroll of the law, the garments of the priests, the first fruits, the tithes, and the uncompleted vows of the Nazarites. These all spoke of the desolated temple and emphasized the cry for help which came from anxious but faithful hearts. Judas then organized

them for attack, dismissing those who in strict accordance with Mosaic requirements were excusable (Deut. xx. 6-9), for it was a time to be faithful in every particular if they would gain divine favor.

30. Gorgias, intending to surprise the Jews, marched up from Emmaus toward Mizpeh at night, only to find that Judas had disappeared. This disappearance he interpreted as flight; but, in reality, it was part of a clever scheme of Judas to mislead the Syrian; for on learning that Gorgias had divided his forces, Judas descended from Mizpeh to the hills south of Emmaus. This he did in order to fall suddenly upon the Syrian camp, hoping, if successful, to surprise Gorgias upon his return from Mizpeh. To nerve his soldiers to one of their impetuous onslaughts, Judas delivered to them a noble address (I. Mac. iv. 8-11), and then commanded them to charge. For a moment the Syrians wavered, then turned and fled toward the plain. The Jews followed in hot pursuit as far south as Azotus, slaying three thousand of the enemy. The camp with all its spoil fell into the hands of the needy troops, who would immediately have given themselves up to the enjoyment of all that they had gained had not Judas, returning from pursuit, given them timely warning regarding the division commanded by Gorgias. Even while he was speaking the Syrians appeared on the heights above, and dismayed at seeing their camp in possession of the Jews, became panic-stricken and fled. The victory was comparatively easy, and the men of Judas were greatly enriched by it, for much gold and silver and silk, besides weapons and supplies of food, came to them. One of the sources of wealth was the company of Phœnician

0 5 10 20 30

Scale of Miles.



slave-traders who had followed the Syrian army intending to buy Jewish captives at a fixed price, so sure had Gorgias and Nicanor been of success.

31. The great victory of Emmaus was secured in 166 B. C. In the following autumn of 165 Lysias himself took the field with an army of sixty thousand foot soldiers and five thousand horse, — large enough seemingly to annihilate the small force with Judas; but the Syrians were forced to fight in a mountainous country against picked men, who were inspired by a common zeal and ready to die rather than to yield. This time the foreign army was taken farther south, in order to avoid the dangerous approaches to the western passes, and was led up on the central ridge from the southwest. Judas had selected his position at Bethsur, about four miles north of Hebron. "The water-shed is lowest at this point, and a narrow pass leads by a beautiful spring under the rocky scarp where Bethsur then stood, west of the road, while to the east a rounded hill rises above a low cliff towards the mountain village of Halhull." It was a strategic situation, and the confidence of the Judeans in their leader made them eager for fight. With a prayer for God's favor Judas led them into battle, and again the Syrians were routed, leaving five thousand of their number on the field. Lysias was satisfied that he had inadequate forces and hastily withdrew to Antioch in order to make greater preparation against his courageous foe (I. Mac. iv. 28-35; II. Mac. xi. 1-12).

32. A decided change of spirit now came to the Jews as the result of these victories. Hitherto they had defended themselves; now they were ready to move forward in their own interests. They were not

yet strong enough to drive out the Syrian garrison in Jerusalem, but they could purify the temple and set up once more the true worship of Jehovah. When Judas made the proposal to undertake this, it met with hearty and unanimous approval (I. Mac. iv. 36, 37; Ant. xii. 7, 6). The victorious little army marched from the camp at Bethsur to Jerusalem. Here a sorry sight met their eyes. The gates to the temple enclosure had been burned and through the blackened openings could be seen the weeds which covered the deserted area; while here and there heaps of stones from the broken walls and the demolished chambers of the priests completed the picture of desolation. In humiliation and grief the people cast themselves on their faces and "cried toward heaven" (I. Mac. iv. 37-40). Stationing a guard to protect himself against incursions from the citadel, Judas set about the cleansing of the sacred enclosure, selecting "priests of blameless life" for the holy work. The stones of the polluted altar of burnt offerings were pulled down and put carefully aside "until there should come a prophet to give an answer concerning them" (I. Mac. iv. 42-46); and everything that had defilement in it was carried away. A new altar was constructed, the broken walls were repaired, and new vessels were provided for the holy places. At last, in the month of December, 165 B. C., just three years after the first sacrifice had been offered to Olympian Zeus, "sacrifice according to the law was offered upon the new altar of burnt offerings," and the hills about resounded with the praises of a happy, grateful people. Eight days were kept as a glad festival much after the manner of the Feast of Tabernacles, and the time was fixed for

yearly remembrance, — to be known as the Feast of Dedication, and afterward as the Feast of Lights (I. Mac. v. 47-59; II. Mac. x. 1-8).

33. Judaism, realizing afresh its worth and power, rejoiced in the evident favor of God, and strengthened itself against that compromise with Hellenism which had thus far brought upon the nation pitiful disaster. As showing a quickened sense of the worth of those sacred writings which Antiochus had attempted to completely destroy (sect. 21), the tradition imbedded in II. Mac. ii. 14 is worthy of notice: "And in like manner Judas also gathered together for us all those writings that had been scattered by reason of the war that befell; and they are still with us." This tradition is found, indeed, in a spurious letter, but its only error may be in attributing to Judas what may have been undertaken soon after his death. All through the account of the temple's restoration are hints of the care with which all taints of Hellenistic heresy were kept away from the sacred undertaking. The way of the law, beset with hardships and difficulties as it had been, was the only way of blessing. To protect the reconsecrated enclosure, Judas built about it walls with strong towers, in which he placed guards. That he might have defence against further attacks from the south and southwest, he fortified Bethsur.

34. The days of rejoicing in Jerusalem proved but a brief respite from the stern experiences of war. All about the little province of Judea were neighbors whose usual hostility was but quickened by the restoration of the temple services. Judas was now, for a time, engaged in what was really a foreign campaign. Proceeding southward, he met the Idumeans at "the

Scorpion pass," just southwest of the Dead Sea, and "gave them a great overthrow." He then turned his attention to the "Sons of Baeon," a company of brigands on the southern border, and punished them severely. Hastening thence across the Jordan, he called the Ammonites to account, and, though they had gathered a large force under Timotheus, a certain Syrian officer, he defeated them repeatedly, and, having taken the town of Jazer, returned to Judea (I. Mac. v. 1-7). He had no sooner reached Jerusalem than tidings came to him of an attack upon the Jews in Gilead, which news was followed by a message of a like attack upon his countrymen in Galilee. It was an anxious time for all Jews dwelling in heathen territory, and Judas felt that quick, decisive measures must be taken or many thousands would be put to death. Indeed, many had already perished. A council was called and the following plan adopted: Simon, the brother of Judas, was to lead three thousand men into Galilee; Judas and Jonathan eight thousand into Gilead, while Joseph and Azarias, captains of the people, with a third force, were to guard Judea, and to make no war against outside peoples during the absence of Judas. The fifth chapter of the First Book of Maccabees is given up to the record of these expeditions.

35. Simon, after several victories, chased the enemy to the gates of Ptolemais and then returned to Judea, bringing with him the Galilean Jews and their possessions. As another has well said, "it was no trifling enterprise on which Judas embarked." His march involved the crossing of the Jordan cleft, an advance through a hostile land with no regular base of sup-

plies, and strenuous efforts to reach the widely separated points of need. It was all accomplished with the same dash and vigor that characterized his exploits in Judea. A friendly tribe of Nabateans, falling in with him on the third day's journey from the Jordan, reported the desperate situation in Bozrah. This city, located sixty miles east of the Jordan and on the old road from Damascus to Moab, was reached by a forced march, captured and completely destroyed. "Nor did he stop even when night came on, but pushed on to the garrison where the Jews happened to be invested and where Timotheus was besieging the place with his army" (Ant. xii. 8, 3). This was the Dathema of I. Maccabees v. 9. Judas arrived just as an assault was being made and prepared at once to relieve the besieged; but the name of "Maccabeus" was enough. Hearing it, the besiegers fled and suffered great loss. The towns Alema, Casphor, Maked, Bosor, as well as others, whose sites at present are uncertain, fell before the triumphing progress of the Jewish forces. The whole campaign was a brilliant success.

36. For the same reason that Simon removed the Jews from Galilee, Judas gathered together all his people in Gilead and took them with him to Judea. They were no longer safe in these outlying pagan districts. While he was returning with these refugees, a town by the name of Ephron refused him a peaceable passage through its streets. At once commands were given to halt and prepare for attack. The next day the host marched through the street of the town stepping over the dead bodies of its inhabitants (I. Mac. v. 9-54). It is not strange that "they came into Judea singing psalms and hymns as they went and

indulging in such tokens of mirth as are usual in triumphs" (Ant. xii. 8, 6). On his return, Judas learned that one part of his plan had failed through the vainglorious ambition of Joseph and Azarias. Wishing to make for themselves a name, they led an attack upon Jamnia and were defeated with considerable loss by Gorgias, who, since the battle at Emmaus, had remained in the land of the Philistines. The writer of the First Book of Maccabees sees in this defeat the just reward for presumption which sought to take out of the hands of the Maccabees, the chosen of God, the work of delivering the people (I. Mac. v. 62). The real presumption in it was the attempt to meet a general of no mean ability in open field. Judas himself would never have attempted that. Both successes, therefore, and defeat gave glory to the Maccabean name, so that "the man Judas and his brethren were greatly renowned in the sight of all Israel and of all the heathen wheresoever their name was heard" (I. Mac. v. 63). If the details in II. Maccabees xii. 32-37, are trustworthy, Judas set out once more against Idumea, probably to get satisfaction from Gorgias, the commander of this region, for his victory at Jamnia. He seized Hebron, demolished its fortifications, and nearly secured Gorgias himself, who, just escaping capture, fled to Mareshah (II. Mac. xii. 35). Judas hastened after him, and by taking Mareshah, became master of the rich, surrounding district including Adullam and the valley of Elah. Passing on down into the Philistine plain, he fell upon Azotus, the ancient Ashdod, and left its idol temple and altar in smoking ruins (I. Mac. v. 68).

37. Judas was now at the height of his power.

His name was respected at Antioch and feared in all the regions around Judea. By the genius of his leadership the temple worship had been re-established, the nation inspired, and bright hopes for the future of Judaism enkindled. Suddenly the news came that Antiochus Epiphanes had died while on his expedition in the far East. The question as to what this might mean to Judea could only be answered as further developments at the Syrian court should show with whom Judas had to deal. The tidings were certainly of the deepest interest to all whom this arch-despot and madman had oppressed. No better evidence of this interest can be found than in the different interpretations of his death. Polybius thinks it was a judgment upon him for attempting to plunder the temple of Artemis, — the last act of his infamous life (Polyb. xxxi. 2). Josephus scouts this idea, declaring it was rather because of his sacrilegious plundering of the temple in Jerusalem (Ant. xii. 9, 1). Unquestionably the bitter experiences of his own failure and the like experiences of his generals in Judea, helped on the painful illness which terminated his life at Tabä in 164 B. C.

+ 38. Upon his death-bed Antiochus appointed Philip, one of his generals, regent in his empire and guardian of his son (I. Mac. vi. 1-15). It will be remembered that Lysias had been given virtually the same position, when Antiochus set out upon his eastern expedition (sect. 29). Trouble was inevitable, such trouble as would prove fatal to the strength of the Seleucid kingdom. Lysias began the assertion of his rights by having the young prince crowned as Antiochus Eupator (I. Mac. vi. 17). At the same

time, Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, brother of Antiochus Epiphanes, was in Rome, where he had been for years a hostage, begging the Romans to recognize his claims to the Syrian throne. In the double rivalry which these names — Philip, Lysias, Eupator, Demetrius — represent, “the last convulsions of the kingdom, which for one hundred and fifty years before had been so powerful, had now begun. In the collapse of the edifice of monarchy, the nation, small though it might be, within the compass of the realm, which had risen up with so much energy in the days of its strength against its arbitrary and pernicious power, might well secure a fragment of its broad lands to rear upon it a new state, if it only comprehended in time how to re-establish and maintain the spoils of its freedom” (Ewald).

39. To the keen eye of Judas the critical situation of affairs in Syria was clear enough. Now was his time to advance. The citadel in Jerusalem — that Hellenistic stronghold in the very centre of Judaism — must be captured. Since the rehabilitation of the temple this citadel had been peculiarly troublesome. Many had been killed on their way into the temple to offer sacrifice by sudden sallies therefrom, and it was always a menace to the temple itself (Ant. xii. 9, 3; I. Mac. vi. 18). Judas set himself resolutely to the formidable task, and there seems to have been good promise of success, when some of the apostates, escaping from the fortress by night, hurried to the king with a cry for help. They based their claim to succor on the fact that they had “left the religious worship of their fathers and adopted that which Antiochus Epiphanes had commanded them to follow” (Ant. xii.

9, 3). Lysias seems now to have realized the real strength of his foe, for an army of one hundred thousand footmen and twenty thousand horsemen, together with a detachment of thirty-two elephants trained for war, was made ready to go to Judea. Accompanied by the young king, Lysias led these forces down the eastern coast and, ascending from the southwest, again took his position at Bethsur, laying siege to the place for many days (I. Mac. vi. 28-31). The Jewish garrison fought bravely, but the overwhelming force was more than a match for their fierce fighting, and Bethsur was soon invested. Lysias then pushed on northward nine miles to Bethzachariah, where Judas, having raised the siege of the citadel of Jerusalem, had placed his camp. This spot, identified with the modern Beit-Sakariyeh, commanded all the approaches from the east, west, and south toward Jerusalem. "It was the last natural line of defence south of the city and one which could neither be outflanked or masked, but which must be attacked and won before any advance could be made" (Conder). The imposing advance of the great army arranged in singular fashion about the elephants as centres, deeply moved the Jews (I. Mac. vi. 32-41); but they had faced a Syrian army too often to be daunted by mere appearances, and in the first attack which Judas made, six hundred of the king's men were slain. Eleazar, the brother of Judas, thinking he had discovered the elephant on which the young king was riding, fought his way single-handed to the beast, crept under it, and inflicting a fatal stab, was himself crushed by the animal's fall. But the utmost bravery and daring were in vain. The odds were too great, and Judas was forced to retreat, or,

as the record in First Maccabees mildly puts it, shrinking from the statement of this bitter reverse, "turned away from them."

40. At some time in the midst of these struggles appeared that proclamation to the faithful which forms the second part of the Book of Enoch, chapters lxxxiii. to xc. In two visions — one of a great world-judgment (lxxxiii. to lxxxiv.), and another of the history of the world until the final judgment (lxxxv. to xc.) — the seer discovers the causes and issues of the calamities that have come upon Israel. By means of apocalyptic symbolism, — made familiar by the Book of Daniel, which book was itself a constant inspiration to these struggling patriots, — man's history is pictured under the forms and deeds of animals, and interest is centred upon that part of the unfolding story where "small lambs were born from the white sheep" (xc. 6), — that is, where those who loved the law took firm stand against the Hellenizing aims of many of the leaders in Israel. The coming of the Syrians, the uprising of the faithful, the prowess of Judas are all successively symbolized; and then, as showing that the writer knew nothing of the death of Judas, the vision becomes prophetic and depicts the intervention of God himself, who will uphold Judas against all his enemies, terribly punish all sinners, set up the New Jerusalem, bring back the dispersed, raise the righteous dead, and lead forth the Messiah (xc. 15-39). This inspiring prophecy gives us the earliest unquestioned reference to the Messiah to be found in apocalyptic literature. He does not, however, transcend the human, but is gifted with that perfection and power that entitle him to supremacy. Upon these hopes the

brave supporters of Judas sustained themselves and fought on.

41. Lysias now marched unhindered to Jerusalem, relieved the citadel, and laid siege to the temple enclosure. As soon as the defeat of Judas at Bethzachariah was accomplished, Bethsur capitulated, and the citizens were set free on parole. It was a dark hour for Judaism. Its brave struggles seemed now destined to utter failure. Added to the presence of the heathen army in the land was a scarcity of supplies, for it was a Sabbath year, in which no grain had been sown, and the influx of Jews from Galilee and Gilead only gave pressure to the need. Many of the besieged deserted, and the bitter end seemed near at hand. But by one of those changes which confirm believing men in their faith in an overruling Providence, the whole situation was suddenly changed. As if God would say to his people, "Your trust shall not be in princes, nor in brave leaders, but in me," the issue was made to depend, not upon the sagacity of Judas, nor upon the bravery of his soldiers, but upon the rivalry in the court of Antioch. Forces far away from Jerusalem were again being used to turn the scales and place upon the side of Judea that religious freedom for which she had, indeed, nobly struggled.

42. While he was before the walls of the temple area, news came to Lysias that Philip, with the army of Antiochus Epiphanes, was marching to Antioch "to assume the government" (I. Mac. vi. 56), in accordance with the dying wishes of the king. Lysias, unwilling to give up the honor he was holding, determined to return at once to Antioch. In order to get away, he offered the Jews peace, guaranteeing them, if they would

surrender, the liberty "to make use of and live according to the laws of their fathers" (Ant. xii. 9, 7), and the preservation of the temple walls. The Jews gladly accepted these terms and evacuated the temple; Lysias, after violating the second provision of his guarantee, since he found the temple securely fortified, marched away, and with his withdrawal the first chapter of the history of the Maccabean struggle comes to a close. Never after this, until A. D. 70, did the continuance of the temple worship again become a critical question.

43. Henceforth there was to be no attempt at forcing Hellenism upon the Jews. The struggle between it and Judaism was to go on, but the basis of contention was shifted. It now appeared more prominently within the nation itself. Up to this point all within the lines of the national party were satisfied with the outcome of the rebellion, as far as religious questions were concerned. The vital requirement was religious freedom. Conscience had triumphed.

X

IV

THE LONG CONTEST FOR POLITICAL FREEDOM

44. "THE year 162 B. C. marks the proper end of the religious war of the Jews. Thereafter conflict was primarily not concerning religion, but government." Such is the text which the strife of parties, the appeals for foreign support, the intervention of heathen rulers, and the constant unrest within the borders of Judea must now help us to interpret. The removal of the Syrian army left the two great parties, the Hellenistic and the National, face to face, with all their old differences intensified and with vital questions to settle. The first of these questions was regarding the high-priesthood. When the king set out for Antioch, Lysias persuaded him to take with him Menelaus the high-priest. He thus aimed to provide against future disturbances among the Jews, for this Menelaus had been the originator of all the mischief which had required armies for its undoing. Antiochus V., thoroughly distrusting the man, sent him into exile, and soon after caused him to be put to death (Ant. xii. 9, 7). Alcimus, a man of Aaronic descent, but a leader in the Hellenistic party, was appointed to his place. With Judas at the head of affairs in Jerusalem, he soon found that he had a title without an office, and retired to Antioch to await further developments. Judas himself, while making no claim to the high-

priesthood, was, if we may trust Josephus (Ant. xii. 11, 2), at this time performing its duties, and he would have no such polluted hands as those of Alcimus ministering at the altar.

45. Meanwhile startling changes had been in progress in the Syrian court. Antiochus and Lysias were successful in their contest with Philip, but soon after the latter's death the fatal hour came to the young king and his general. Demetrius, eluding the vigilance of the Romans, made his escape from Italy and landed at Tripolis on the Phœnician coast (II. Mac. xiv. 1). He at once announced his purpose of becoming king, and receiving the support of the Syrian army, which soon after his arrival declared in his favor, he "entered into the palace of his ancestors" (I. Mac. vii. 1, 2). Antiochus and Lysias were put to death.

46. Before this new king appeared Alcimus and the company of apostates who had gathered about him in Antioch. They made it appear that Judas and his brethren had not only been oppressors of many who like themselves had been driven out of the country, but also that he had been guilty of treason toward the king in putting to death those who would have been his supporters. Demetrius listened readily to their complaints. He confirmed the appointment of Alcimus and delegated Bacchides, one of his generals, to see that Alcimus was installed in office, and that the enemies of the king were punished. Once more the clouds of war gathered in the Judean sky. The appearance of Alcimus at Jerusalem brings to light the first trace of that attitude of the Hasideans which afterward became pronounced and pernicious in the policy of the Pharisees. It is difficult to understand how

many of them could have listened to the fair words of Alcimus and thus have been led to accept him, unless it was that their satisfaction with the religious freedom which had been given them put the matter of government in another light, and caused them to hesitate about renouncing a legitimate successor to the office of high-priest. At any rate, they paid dearly for their want of caution, for sixty of them, probably picked men, were at once put to death in direct violation of promises of protection. Josephus makes Bacchides the perpetrator of this bloody deed (Ant. xii. 10, 2). The truth of the matter probably is that both he and Alcimus were equally concerned in it. This shameful and malignant treachery struck fear and trembling into the hearts of the people, and turned their anxious faces once more to Judas as their leader and protector (I. Mac. vii. 8, 18).

47. Bacchides, leaving behind him a force sufficient to support Alcimus, now returned to Syria. He halted long enough at Bezeth, probably the modern Bezetha, to seize the deserters and those who had harbored the fugitives and put them to death, and then he left the country to the embittered will of Alcimus (I. Mac. vii. 19, 20). As the latter could not put foot inside the temple enclosure, he was virtually only a civil ruler in the land, and accordingly he devoted himself to making his high-priesthood a reality. He ingratiated himself with all kinds of people by kindly words and agreeable manners until he had gathered a considerable army of supporters, whom Josephus characterizes for the most part as "wicked and deserters" (Ant. xii. 10, 3). With these he travelled up and down the land, murdering and destroying whenever he could

lay hands upon sympathizers with Judas. In the mean time Judas himself was not idle, and Alcimus soon discovered that he was steadily losing in a kind of contest in which his opponents were more skilled than himself. Matters had come to such a pass that Alcimus and his men dared not show themselves openly, and there was nothing left for him to do but to appeal to the king (I. Mac. vii. 21-25). He went himself to Antioch and so "exasperated" Demetrius against Judas, that Nicanor, a man with a spirit suited to his mission, for "he bare deadly hate unto Israel" (I. Mac. vii. 26), was sent with a large force to Jerusalem.

48. In the Second Book of Maccabees there is a curious tradition of the personal love and admiration of Nicanor for Judas. He could not bear to have Judas out of his sight, entreating him to marry and give up his unsettled life. The tradition goes so far as to say that Judas actually did this, and that Nicanor had determined that Judas should be the successor of Demetrius (see xiv. 22-26). The whole account is so extravagant that it stultifies itself. The sober, dispassionate recital of the First Book gives us the real progress of events. Nicanor did try to win his way at first by treacherous friendliness, but failed through the keenness and prudence of Judas. His only remaining resource was battle, and the engagement took place at Capharsalama. The site of this ancient village is uncertain, but it was probably near the borders of Samaria, in the plain below Modein. Nicanor was defeated and fell back upon Jerusalem, where he could have the further support of the garrison in the citadel. As he crossed from the citadel to the temple, priests went out to greet him and tell him of the sacrifice which, as

obedient subjects of the king, they had offered for Demetrius; but the defeated Nicanor was in no mood to receive them. He ridiculed their sacred duties and threatened to destroy the temple if they did not deliver up to him Judas and his men (I. Mac. vii. 27-35). This idle threat sent the priests back into the temple to weep and pray that the Lord would cause this blasphemer to perish.

49. Their prayer was soon answered. Nicanor marched northwest to Beth-horon to wait there for reinforcements from Syria. Judas took his position at Adasa, about four miles north of Jerusalem, and at the point on the plateau where the roads from the north and from Beth-horon come together. Like that of Bethzacharias, the place could not be easily outflanked, and proved a fine vantage-ground. Judas had three thousand (Josephus says one thousand), and Nicanor nine thousand. The disparity in numbers was such as had more than once only nerved the Jews to fight with more determined bravery. On the morning of the thirteenth of Adar, 161 B. C., Nicanor advanced and the hosts joined battle. Tradition has sought to glorify the splendid victory which Judas gained by accounts of visions which came to him before the battle. He is said to have seen the noble high-priest, Onias III., holding up his hands in prayer for the nation, and, as he prayed, there stood beside him a majestic, hoary-headed figure, Jeremias, the prophet of God. He held in his right hand a sword of gold which he gave to Judas, declaring that therewith he should wound his enemies (II. Mac. xv. 12, 16). In the early part of the battle Nicanor was killed, and before the fierce onslaught of the Jews the Syrians gave way

and fled. As the soldiers of Judas hurried after them, they sounded an alarm with their trumpets to call the villagers in the hill-country to help in cutting off the retreat. All the way from Adasa down across the valley of Ajalon to the fortress of Gazara, the dead of the Syrian army lay scattered on the hillsides. It was an overpowering victory remembered ever after by an annual festival on "Nicanor's Day" (I. Mac. vii. 44-46). The taint of savagery which is revealed in the order of Judas to cut off the head and right hand of the Syrian general and to carry them to Jerusalem to give emphasis to his defiance of the citadel is quite in accord with the spirit of the times (II. Mac. xv. 31, 32), though for us it casts a shadow over the noble figure of Judas. It certainly was a ghastly object-lesson to his enemies.

✕ 50. Once more for a little while the land of Judea had rest. Judas was master of the situation. Could he remain so? That question now took precedence of all others in his thoughts. Only political independence could guarantee and make available to the fullest degree the religious liberty which had been acquired. There was no hope of peace from the Syrian throne. Nicanor's punishment would bring another army upon them, and they had already experienced their terrible weakness when Syria really put forth her full strength. There was one power whose fame was already known among the Judean hills,—that of Rome. Already it had proved more than a match for the power of Syria in the famous battle of Magnesia, 190 B. C., and ever since had kept a watchful eye upon the doings of the Syrian kings. If Judas knew much about the court at Antioch, he knew that more

than once it had been compelled to change its policy at command from Rome. There was no real friendship between the two kingdoms. Demetrius himself had run away from Italy, and though he afterward gained recognition from the Romans as king, yet they were ready to cripple his power especially by such means as were offered through division of interests or alliance with subordinate peoples. All circumstances were favorable for an appeal to the great western power for help. Could Judas have foreseen what this appeal would ultimately mean to Israel, as a prophet of old he would have lifted up his own voice against it. Alas! he never dreamed of the coming degeneracy of his own family and of those internal dissensions which should bring the Roman governors and procurators into closest relations with the destiny of the nation.

51. Soon after the battle of Adasa, Judas sent two men, Eupolemus and Jason, as ambassadors to the Roman Senate, with instructions to make a league of "amity and confederacy" which would take from them the Syrian yoke (I. Mac. viii. 17-18). The Senate gave them a cordial reception and sent them back with a treaty inscribed on tablets of bronze the principal provisions of which were that the Jews should give help to the Romans and the Romans to the Jews, in times of war. A close inspection of these terms brings out the fact that the Romans were practically left to act according to their own pleasure. Indeed, the course of events will show us that the Romans did not help the Jews forward on the way to political independence so much by direct assistance as by their interference with the kingdom of Syria. As soon as the treaty was concluded, word was sent from Rome

to Demetrius to stop his maltreatment of Judea, and this word was accompanied by a threat that further complaint against him would bring down upon him the combined forces of the Roman power (I. Mac. viii. 31, 32). Such seem to be the facts in this disputed chapter. Inaccuracies, such as are usual in this book when explaining foreign relations, and details of information, which were known to the author rather than to Judas, have cast suspicion upon the present position of the chapter in the book. There is, however, adequate reason for the acceptance of the fact of the treaty itself.

52. It was a long journey from Jerusalem to Rome and return. Before the tidings of the alliance had reached either Antioch or Judea sad changes had come to the Jews. The defeat of Nicanor aroused Demetrius to a more determined effort to punish Judas. Bacchides was ordered to proceed against the rebels with an army of twenty thousand foot and two thousand horse. The repeated appearance of large armies began to wear upon the spirit of the Jews. The Hasideans also had their ardor cooled by the purely political nature of the struggle, and Judas found difficulty in keeping about him a sufficient force to offer any effective resistance (I. Mac. ix. 6). The few men who remained faithful tried in vain to dissuade him from battle. He would not stain his honor nor theirs by flight, and though the little band of eight hundred men fought desperately all day and won some successes, the issue was as had been feared. Not only were the Jews completely defeated, but Judas himself was killed (I. Mac. ix. 7-18). Under a flag of truce his dead body was recovered from the enemy and carried to the village of

Modein for burial. Thus perished at Eleasa one of the bravest, most devoted spirits that the world has seen. From the day that Mattathias called him to stand with him for the law, he toiled, suffered, and fought for the sacred cause. He saved the nation from destruction and wrested from the strong hand of Syria the priceless boon of religious freedom. His death was the crowning sorrow of those few years which had brought mourning into many a Jewish home, and throughout the land there was for him great lamentation (I. Mac. ix. 19, 20).

53. The calamitous battle of Eleasa (Il'asa, near Beth-horon) was fought in 161 B. C. For seven years thereafter persecution kept up its deadly work. Alcimus, who had come with Bacchides from Antioch, was given full power as high-priest, which meant that the Hellenists were to have complete freedom of action. With what zeal they exercised their new authority may be learned from the brief statements in the First Book of Maccabees, where it is recorded that Bacchides chose "the ungodly men," that is, men of Hellenistic sympathies, and made them lords of the country. These then made inquiry and search for Judas' friends, and brought them to Bacchides, who took vengeance upon them and used them despitely (I. Mac. ix. 25, 26). To the horrors of persecution was added the scourge of famine, until the afflictions of the faithful seemed unparalleled. Instinctively they turned to the family of the Hasmoneans for leadership, and selected Jonathan to be their "ruler and captain" (I. Mac. ix. 28-31). He was a different type of man from his brother Judas. It is questionable how far he could have succeeded had it not been

for the differences among the Syrians themselves. He was crafty and diplomatic. His successes were those of a politician rather than of a warrior, though he did not and could not escape the disagreeable duties of war.

54. Bacchides was particularly anxious to get hold of every member of the noted family of Mattathias and at once directed his energies toward securing Jonathan. The latter fled into the wilderness of Tekoa, several miles southeast of Bethlehem, and made his encampment about a reservoir which Josephus names Asphar (*Ant.* xiii. 1, 2). In order to be free from the impedimenta of his army, he sent them under the care of his brother John to the Nabatheans across the Jordan. The camp-train was attacked by a tribe from near Medeba, and John was killed. To avenge this, Jonathan availed himself of the opportunity afforded by a great wedding feast in this same tribe. Coming suddenly upon the joyous procession, he put as many to death as were unable to escape into the mountains. It was on the return from this expedition that he first met Bacchides, who was waiting for him on the eastern bank of the Jordan. Ignoring the fact that it was the Sabbath day, and realizing the desperate situation in which he was placed, Jonathan advanced to the attack, and after driving back the Syrians with considerable loss, escaped with his followers by swimming the Jordan (*I. Mac.* ix. 33-49). Bacchides now changed his policy. Instead of chasing a band of outlaws among the mountains and into the desert, he determined to cover the land with secure fortifications, whence sallies could be safely made against the Jews, and to take the sons of the principal Jews as hostages and shut them up in the citadel in Jerusalem. Into

such strongholds he converted Jericho, Emmaus (Amwas), Beth-horon, Bethel, Timnath (Tibnath), Pharathoni (Ferata?), Tephon (Teffeh), Bethsür, Tekoa, and Gazara. As far as these can be with certainty identified, they were frontier towns and constituted a strong line of defence.

55. Bacchides, by this one move, accomplished more than all his predecessors, and the Hellenists were free to act as they desired. Alcimus was at the head of the nation, and the chief interest of Demetrius was to secure the regular payment of tribute. At this time Alcimus began alterations in the temple which sent a wave of indignation over the land. He took down "the wall of the inner court," and thereby effaced the line of demarcation between the "sacred enclosure adjacent to the temple and the outer court into which Gentiles had been always admitted." There was to be no longer any separation between Jew and Gentile in the worship of the temple. To a people whose chief glory was their separateness from the nations, such an act was climacteric in its effrontery. It was but natural that the death of the high-priest, which soon followed, was interpreted as Heaven's own judgment on his wickedness. The high-priest's office was now vacant and remained so until Jonathan himself — strange reversal! — was appointed to it by Demetrius in the year 153 B. C. With the land in comparative quiet and with no high-priest to support, Bacchides felt himself under no necessity to remain in Judea, and so returned to Antioch. For two years the land had rest. The followers of Jonathan were doubtless kept away from the cultivated country, but were not subject to any more direct form of persecution.

56. That Jonathan was not idle during this time is clear from the episode recorded in I. Maccabees ix., — the only bit of history which this book has saved respecting the years 160–153 B. C. We have no details of the method by which the two brothers raised again the spirits and hopes of the national party; but the absence of an active Syrian force, and diligent effort on the part of those whose fidelity to the law was unswerving, brought increasing strength to Jonathan's standard. It is also not unlikely that this enlarging power was used to harass the Hellenists both in Jerusalem and elsewhere. At any rate, they saw with apprehension the changing situation and secretly laid a plan before Bacchides by which he could get possession of Jonathan and Simon and put an end to the movement which they represented. Bacchides agreed to the plan and marched with a large force into Judea; but the attainment of success was not so easy as it had been made to appear. The Syrian general seems to have expected the Hellenists in Judea to capture Jonathan for him, and because they could not, he quietly put fifty of their leaders to death. Jonathan, meanwhile, kept thoroughly informed by means of spies and deserters, fortified himself at Bethbasi (probably Bethhogla at the northern end of the Dead Sea), and was so successful in circumventing the Syrians that Bacchides, in anger, once more resorted to massacring those who had misled him, and then resolved to raise the siege and go home. His disappointment and chagrin made opportunity for the crafty Jonathan to offer solace and at the same time to further his own interests. He proposed to Bacchides a dignified way of getting out of an unfortunate venture; namely, a

friendly alliance for each other's good. Bacchides accepted the proposal gladly, and after an exchange of prisoners, left the land forever (I. Mac. ix. 58-72).

57. A new order of progress now began in Judea. Jonathan had promised to make no war against Syria, and the Syrians yet remained in the citadel of Jerusalem, and in the strongholds on the frontier. At Jerusalem the Hellenistic party was in control. Jonathan, therefore, selected Michmash, about seven miles north of the capital, as the centre of the national party. It was a place of much historic interest to the Jews, but was chosen rather for its security than for past associations. In the years of rest that succeeded, the people had ample time to reflect upon the sufferings and limitations brought to them by the party which still held possession of Jerusalem. The constraint of a foreign power was removed, and once more the idea of a purified nation powerfully appealed to them. Jonathan, as fast as he gained strength, used it against the apostates (I. Mac. ix. 73), and thus gained completely the sympathy of the zealous Hasideans. When the story again opens in the year 153 B. C., he appears as a leader recognized by the Syrian court, through whose troubles he was now destined to make unexpected advancement.

X

V

THE ATTAINMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

58. IN Syria "an unparalleled comedy was to be played" in which Jonathan was called upon to take a prominent part. A young man from Smyrna, named Balas, of low birth, but with a startling resemblance to Antiochus Eupator, announced himself as also a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and laid claim to the throne in Antioch. Attalus II., King of Pergamum, who gave to the young pretender the name of Alexander, Ptolemy Philometor of Egypt and Ariarathes V. of Cappadocia, supported his claim. He gained, besides, the recognition of Rome, which was ready at any moment to make trouble in Syria (Polyb. xxxiii. 16). The time was ripe for a change in Syria itself, for Demetrius had become a miserable drunkard (Polyb. xxxiii. 14, sect. 1), and had alienated his own people by his sloth and his harsh, overbearing conduct. Accordingly, when Alexander arrived at Ptolemais, the soldiers gave the town into his hands, and the struggle for the throne began. Demetrius knew only too well the fighting strength of the Jews, and, in his alarm, one of his first projects was to make them his friends. He despatched ambassadors to Jonathan granting him the right to assemble troops and delivered into his hands the hostages which Bacchides had shut up in the citadel. Jonathan went to Jerusalem in-

vested with full power, and improved his time in fortifying the city and the temple mount. With the exception of those in the citadel, and at Bethsur, all the defenders of the various fortresses fled to Antioch, and Jonathan's position was greatly strengthened (I. Mac. x. 3-14). This, however, was but the beginning of favors that came very near making Judea completely independent. Balas heard of the promises of Demetrius and also of the quality of the Maccabeans, and, resolving that Demetrius should not outbid him, he sent messengers with a letter to Jonathan containing his appointment as high-priest and with a purple robe and a crown of gold, insignia of his future princely rank. Jonathan accepted them all, and at the Feast of Tabernacles in 153 B. C. put on, for the first time, the vestments of the high-priest (I. Mac. x. 15-21). He was now, indeed, prince of Judea. He had gained at one stroke, and with no effort on his part, what Judas had failed to attain after a long, brave struggle. He was not, however, as yet complete master of Judea. The citadel was still in the possession of his opponents, and the taxes had not been remitted. Nevertheless, if he could maintain himself, he had made a long advance toward independence.

59. But the rivalry for Jewish favor was not yet at an end. Demetrius made one more effort, and in his promises included those terms which would have made Jonathan's independence unquestionable; namely, release from tribute, surrender of the citadel, enlargement of territory, and endowment for the expenses of the temple service. These, together with other offers, splendid as they were, Jonathan and the people declined, because of deep distrust of Demetrius. It

was well that they did, for, in the first battle between the two rivals, Demetrius was defeated and slain (I. Mac. x. 22-50). The Hellenists were now virtually silenced and the security of Jonathan's position was demonstrated by the course of the events which followed shortly afterward in Ptolemais. In 150 B. C., at the time of the wedding of Alexander and Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, who hoped to gain much by the alliance, Jonathan was a highly honored guest, being clothed in purple and made to sit beside the king. Some of the Greek party thought it a fit time, singularly enough, to make accusations against Jonathan. The king not only refused to listen, but also made it clear that no one to whom they might complain should favor them, so they fled from the city. Thereupon Alexander honored him with the titles of "General and Governor of a district," and Jonathan returned to Jerusalem to spend an undisturbed year in establishing himself in his suddenly acquired powers. At the end of that time he was able, upon call, to place ten thousand well-equipped men in the field.

60. All too soon the king, whose unrighteous claims Jonathan had supported, exhibited his real character. His incompetency, debauchery, and shamelessness made him detestable to a large number of his subjects. Hence, in 147 B. C. when Demetrius II. appeared on the Syrian coast, as a rival of the king, Jonathan found himself the only foreign supporter of the threatened Balas, and his fidelity involved him almost immediately in trouble. Apollonius, the governor of Coele-Syria, declared for Demetrius and was appointed general in command of the whole coast to the borders

of Egypt. Taking up his position at Jamnia, he sent a pompous challenge to Jonathan to meet him in the plain. Jonathan accepted, took possession of Joppa, where Apollonius had placed a governor, and then marched directly southward, it seemed, into the trap which had been prepared for him, for one thousand men had been concealed to come up behind him as he moved southward, and cut off his retreat. The plan seemed well made and promised the Syrians a victory, but the Jewish troops were formed into a square, and all day long stoutly resisted attack. Toward evening, Simon, with a separate detachment kept aside for the purpose, fell upon the wearied troops of Apollonius and sent them flying in panic-stricken disorder to Azotus. Jonathan followed, set fire to Azotus and its heathen temple, and destroyed a large part of the Syrian force. This signal victory brought him not only much spoil, but also from the grateful Balas a golden brooch for fastening his cloak, and the Philistine city of Ekron with its territory as a source of revenue.

61. Authorities differ as to the motive which led Ptolemy into Syria at this time. The author of First Maccabees declares that it was an ambitious design to get possession of Alexander's kingdom. Josephus, on the contrary, states that he made ready his land and sea forces to go to the help of Alexander. The truth of the matter is, in all probability, as Diodorus presents it, that upon starting he had an honest intention of helping his son-in-law, but upon learning the real state of affairs after his arrival in Syria, changed his mind. Whatever its motive, his defection proved fatal to Alexander, who, in the battle which was fought near Antioch, was defeated, and Ptolemy so severely

wounded that he shortly after died. Alexander ended his wretched career in Arabia by the hand of an assassin, and Demetrius II. became king in 145 B. C. (I. Mac. xi. 1-19).

62. After his victory over Apollonius, Jonathan felt himself warranted in attempting the removal of that thorn in the flesh of Judaism, — the citadel in Jerusalem. Elaborate preparations were made, and an energetic siege begun, when reports concerning it were carried to Demetrius by "certain ungodly persons who hated their own nation." Ten years before this time the tidings would have been sufficient to have brought into Judea a formidable army. Now Jonathan was summoned to Ptolemais to explain his action. Without raising the siege, Jonathan obeyed, taking with him not only an embassy of elders and priests, but also a goodly supply of gifts. In some way the cunning leader won completely the good-will of Demetrius. He may have set before him the comparative weakness of the Hellenistic party, and in addition reminded him of the valuable services he had rendered his predecessors. At any rate, he came away with far more than the pardon of his offence. Demetrius confirmed all the previous honors that had been given him, refused to listen to the charge of the Hellenists, and, adding to Judea the three frontier districts of Samaria, — Ephraim, Lydda, and Ramathaim, — exempted both them and Judea from tribute. Jonathan promised in return three hundred talents (I. Mac. xi. 22-28) and his friendship. In these successive treaties with Jonathan two facts stand out with increasing clearness, — the growing power of the Jewish state and the uncertain, tottering condition of the Seleucid

dynasty. Both are needed to explain such concessions as these just made. Ewald sees in the specification in I. Maccabees xi. 34, "for all such as do sacrifice in Jerusalem," — a defining clause which really allowed the inhabitants of the fortresses to remain in them as before (v. 331). The clause seems rather to refer to exemption from taxes, but the distinction set forth might well carry with it the implication above given, and thus account for no express mention of the siege of Acra, the real occasion of the conference.

63. Jonathan had not long to wait for an opportunity to give proof of his friendship. The army in such a kingdom as Syria was the sovereign's right arm, and short-sighted indeed was the ruler who, for the sake of personal indulgences, or for civic economy, weakened its power. Demetrius had aroused the ill-will of his troops, not only by his cruelty, but also by his refusal to pay them in times of peace, as commanders before him had done, and by his manifest preference for mercenaries. All this a certain Diodotus, surnamed Tryphon, a former general of Alexander and a traitor to him as well, reported to the guardian of Antiochus, the young son of Alexander, persuading him that he could make the boy king in place of Demetrius (I. Mac. xi. 38-40). While Tryphon was absent upon this mission, a popular uprising in Antioch, having its cause likewise in the hatred of the people for Demetrius, made the king a prisoner in his palace. The news of the growing discontent in the Syrian capital led Jonathan to suggest to Demetrius what might be for his advantage and certainly for the welfare of Israel; namely, the withdrawal of the garrisons from all the fortresses in Judea. Demetrius was

ready to make any promise, "for he lied in all that he spake" (I. Mac. xi. 53), if only Jonathan would help him. Three thousand troops were at once forwarded to Antioch and arrived just in time to defend the king against the rabble. They cleared the streets with terrible slaughter and compelled the inhabitants to beg for mercy. Demetrius was grateful, but his gratitude did not prevent him from shamelessly repudiating all the promises he had made (I. Mac. xi. 41-53).

64. On general principles any Syrian king in these times could ill afford to break faith with serviceable allies; but Demetrius little knew his own particular extremity. He had hardly settled down to enjoy the dearly bought tranquillity of his capital, when Tryphon appeared with Antiochus "who reigned and put on a diadem" (I. Mac. xi. 54). The discontented troop rallied to the new standard and the days of the kingship of Demetrius were soon numbered. In his first battle with Tryphon he was defeated, and Antioch passed into the hands of Antiochus. The young king confirmed Jonathan in his high-priesthood, as well as in the governorship of Judea, and of the new districts given him by Demetrius (sect. 62), and sent him royal presents which made full recognition of the dignity and value of his leadership. Simon, the elder brother, was made military commander of the king from the Ladder of Tyre down to the borders of Egypt. Jonathan espoused the cause of Antiochus with enthusiasm and set forth to bring all Palestine and Syria, as far as Damascus, under his control. The trans-Jordanic region yielded first, and then Jonathan turned to Philistia. Ascalon readily acknowledged

the new king, but Gaza refused to do so, and made necessary a siege which soon brought the recalcitrant city to terms. Both cities were important additions to the Syrian alliance (I. Mac. xi. 55-62). By this time Demetrius had recovered from his first defeat, and his generals appeared in upper Galilee with a large army intending "to remove Jonathan from office." At first it seemed that they would be successful, for, by strategy at Hazor, west of Lake Merom, they hemmed the Jewish forces in between two fires, so that a large number fled. The First Book of Maccabees states that Jonathan, Mattathias, the son of Absalom, and Judas, the son of Calphi, saved the day by withstanding the enemy (xi. 70). Even Josephus's estimate of fifty is an exaggeration of bravery, but brave the Jews certainly were, who stood their ground and so turned the tide of battle that a decided victory was won and the Syrians pursued to Kadesh. Simon, in the mean time, was also successful in the siege of Bethsur in which he placed a Jewish garrison (I. Mac. xi. 63-74).

65. Seemingly in order to gratify his own sense of leadership and to show to his friends and enemies alike his relationship to foreign powers, Jonathan now renewed his friendship with Rome. He sent ambassadors also to other places for the same purpose. No material aid was sought, but simply that confirmation of the good-will of earlier days that would dignify anew his rulership in Israel. A bit of Jewish pride is evident in the statement that "none of these things was needed" (I. Mac. xii. 9) on the part of Israel. It was only another way of expressing their feeling that they were a favored nation and that they conferred rather than received honor in entering upon such

negotiations. Both Rome and Sparta responded cordially, especially the latter, in whose letter of greeting was the claim of brotherhood on the surprising ground of being also of the stock of Abraham (I. Mac. xii. 21). It is interesting to note that Jonathan, as Judas had done in the case of the previous embassy, sent Jews with Greek names; and it is also remarkable that, like Judas, Jonathan did not live to see the return of the ambassadors.

66. Once more Demetrius threatened the land with an invasion and Jonathan hastened northward in order to keep the war out of his own territory. The armies met at Hamath, in the valley of the Orontes, but there was no fighting, for, when the Syrians learned that their plan to make a night attack had been discovered and thwarted, they quietly withdrew under cover of their camp-fires. They could not be found, though Jonathan followed hard after them the next day, as far as the river Eleutherus, — an old boundary between Palestine and Syria (Strabo xvi. 2, 12). Turning eastward he first punished the Zabadeans, a robber tribe in the Arabian desert, then passed by the way of Damascus southward to Jerusalem. While Jonathan was in the north, Simon had looked after the fortresses in the south. In addition to placing strong garrisons at Ascalon and Joppa, he erected a new stronghold at Adida on the edge of the Shephelah hills, west of Lydda. There was little fear after these preparations that Demetrius could reach Jerusalem from the sea (I. Mac. xii. 24-34).

67. The time had now come to think again of Jerusalem itself. Through all these years of power and expansion the hated citadel had not yet been subdued.

At a council of the elders it was voted to restore the broken walls of the city and the temple area, and to build in the city another wall which should completely cut off the citadel from the Upper Market. The purpose of this was to starve the garrison into surrender (I. Mac. xii. 35-37).

68. Jonathan's power had reached its zenith, when another treacherous scheme in Syria involved him in its toils and ended his life. Tryphon wished to be king of Syria. It were not difficult to believe that this had been his ambition from the time he sought out the young Antiochus. Now he simply unmasked it. One of the very uncertain factors in realizing his plan was Jonathan, who was a friend to Antiochus, and who had besides much more to fear politically from Tryphon than from the young king. Tryphon came to Bethshan, in the valley of Jezreel, and there Jonathan met him with an army of forty thousand chosen men. It is well to note in passing what an index this large army is of the power of the Judean state. Tryphon, however, did not come to fight. That he did not dare to do, and, moreover, it was the man he wanted. Hence began that course of treachery about which the only surprising feature is that Jonathan himself did not recognize it. Assurances of good-will, generous gifts, the promise of Ptolemais and other strongholds, among which was included the citadel at Jerusalem, and a continued friendly alliance, — these were the means of persuading Jonathan to dismiss all but one thousand of his men, who were to accompany him to Ptolemais. It may have been the very ambition of Jonathan which blinded him. Besides, this was not the first time that Ptolemais had been offered as a gift. The plot suc-

ceeded all too well. Upon his arrival at the city Jonathan was made a prisoner and his troop massacred. Tryphon then attempted to destroy another detachment of two thousand sent by Jonathan into Galilee. In this he completely failed, and the news was carried to Jerusalem of the fate of Jonathan and his men. Naturally it was supposed that Jonathan had been put to death, and the whole land was in mourning. Through eighteen years he had enjoyed and constantly strengthened the confidence of the people in his leadership. They were stricken again as they had been when Judas was taken, and the excitement and satisfaction which followed the news of this calamity in all the surrounding heathen districts gave evidence of his strength and worth (I. Mac. xii. 39-53).

69. One brother of the Hasmoneans was left, and, in some respects, the noblest of them all, — Simon. He was older than Jonathan, but with that same modest, self-sacrificing spirit which marks his action at this serious juncture, he had subordinated himself to Jonathan; while in both civil and military affairs he had had wide experience. Seeing the need for immediate and resolute action, he called the people together, and in a speech full of spirit and devotion offered himself as leader. This was done with no vain eagerness for honor, but rather with a sacrifice of self to the needs of his people, and as such the offer was recognized and unanimously accepted (I. Mac. xiii. 1-9). Simon's co-operation with his brother in all plans of national defence and expansion made him ready to act at once with the highest efficiency. He finished the work at Jerusalem and sent one of his generals to take complete possession of Joppa. This city, hitherto Gentile, was

now made Jewish territory, and thus established as an effective outpost for Jerusalem (I. Mac. xiii. 10, 11). Tryphon soon discovered that he had not materially furthered his cause by getting possession of the person of Jonathan. Simon took the field against him and stationed himself at Adida to oppose his advance on Jerusalem. Now, apparently for the first time, Simon learned that his brother had not been put to death, for Tryphon sent messengers offering to release him upon the payment of an hundred talents of silver and the deliverance of two of his sons as hostages. The offer placed Simon in a very trying position. On one side he completely distrusted Tryphon, and on the other, he feared the people, if he appeared to hesitate about the deliverance of his brother. Accordingly he sent the money and the children, and the issue was as he expected, — Jonathan was still kept a prisoner. Tryphon then marched southward in order to reach Jerusalem from Idumea by the way of Adora (Adoraim). Simon kept between him and the capital and at the same time pushed on vigorously the siege of the citadel. Learning, through messengers sent to him, of the extremity of the besieged, Tryphon hurried his cavalry to their relief; but a heavy fall of snow frustrated the attack and made necessary a complete change of plans. He marched southward around the Dead Sea and passed through Moab into Gilead. At Barcama, a site at present unknown, he murdered Jonathan and then returned to Antioch. Again the people were plunged into deep grief, and Simon but expressed their appreciation of the lost leader and his family when he carried his body to Modein and erected a costly monument to their memory (I. Mac. xiii. 12-30).

70. Thus perished the man who was the real founder of the Maccabean state. It is only by casual statements here and there that one gathers the details which picture the conditions of the time. Within the life of the nation itself religious party-lines were being more sharply defined. Many of the nationalists, driven by the actual presence of an enemy in the land into co-operation with the Hasmoneans, were, nevertheless, out of sympathy with their wider aims. Under the leadership of Jonathan the Greek party had been increasingly limited, and the great leader had inspired such confidence in himself that he was able to call together an army of fifty thousand men. The changing situation in Syria and his own shrewdness brought him almost within reach of the goal of all his striving, — the independence of Judea. Had he lived he would certainly have realized his ambition; but, though he himself could not enter into this "promised land," he had so far unified and strengthened the people that it was possible for them soon after his death to throw off finally the yoke of Syria. To him was given the honor of the "high-priesthood," making the Hasmoneans thenceforth both the religious and civil heads of the nation. He bequeathed to Simon the privilege of realizing the hope of all his service, and with that realization the second stage in the history of the Maccabees is reached.

71. Tryphon's extremity soon proved Simon's opportunity. Under guise of a surgical operation the former had Antiochus put to death, and then he himself as king revealed the baseness and worthlessness of his character, alienating both the soldiers and the people. Demetrius II. (Nicator) was thereby strengthened in his

hope of recovering supremacy. As the antagonist of Tryphon, Simon sent him assurances of support, provided he would grant in return freedom to the Jews. Demetrius's reply is given in full in I. Maccabees xiii. 36-40, and is notable in these particulars: it recognizes Simon as high-priest, and does not go through the empty form of either appointing or confirming him; it renews all the covenants made with Jonathan in 145 B. C.; and it removes the last mark of Jewish dependence, — the payment of the tribute. "Thus the yoke of the heathen was taken away from Israel in the one hundred and seventieth year" (xiii. 41), and that year, 143 B. C., became the dating point of a new era; for "the affection of the people to Simon was so great that in their contracts with one another and in their public records, they wrote: 'In the first year of Simon, the benefactor and ethnarch of the Jews'" (Ant. xiii. 6, 7; I. Mac. xiii. 42).

VI

JUDAISM IN SYRIA AND EGYPT

72. It was one thing to bring Hellenism into Judea ; it was quite another to bring the Jews face to face with its power and charm in the great capitals of Syria and Egypt. Both Antioch and Alexandria were embodiments of an advanced Hellenization. Both gave to the Jews the rights of citizens, and in both was found that broader type of Judaism which, while holding to the sacredness of the law and the necessity of the temple-worship, was open to the better qualities of the heathen life about it. The subtle influence of daily association took the edge from sharp prejudice, and especially in Egypt conservatism was not proof against the energetic speculativeness of Greek thought. Unfortunately data are wanting for estimating with any degree of fulness the social life of the Syrian capital. As compared with Alexandria, its interest in literary pursuits was meagre and unproductive. In all the luxuries of life, however, it was foremost. Glimpses which are given us of the court life during the struggles of Judas and Jonathan reveal a dissoluteness which must have had a deadening effect upon the city. Enjoyment was the main occupation of its inhabitants when they were not engaged in the repeated quarrels about the throne. By virtue of the rights given to them at the beginning, the Jews formed a separate community in the city and had their

own organization. They were thus apart, while still within, the circle of influences which modified, in various degrees, their inherited conceptions. In Antioch, as well as in Alexandria, they profited by all the opportunities given them for trade, and were a thriving, industrious, well-to-do class. Their synagogue was one of the ornaments of the city. They were compelled to adopt the Greek language from the very necessities of their environment and thus had opened to them the literary stores of Greece. It is this double relationship, — on one side, to that part of the city which belonged exclusively to them as Jews, and, on the other, to the city at large, which was the embodiment of a complex social and religious life, — that explains both the tenacity and the pliancy of the Judaism of the dispersion.

73. From time to time in the unfolding of the Macabean history, our attention has been directed to Antioch. It was the refuge of many of the Hellenized Jews who were compelled to fly from Judea. There, too, the high-priest of the Greek party found an efficient supporter in the occupant of the Syrian throne. Antioch itself had many sympathizers with the broader views of the Judean Hellenists. Certainly this was the case in Egypt which was, also, at this time, an asylum for refugees from Judea, who were cordially received because of the faithful support always given by the Egyptian Jews to the Ptolemaic dynasty. Among those who sought safety in Alexandria was one who was destined to contribute a singular feature to the Judaism in Egypt. This was Onias IV., the son of the faithful high-priest deposed by Antiochus Epiphanes and afterwards murdered at the instigation of

Menelaus. Onias was a mere boy when he reached Alexandria, but he was welcomed as only the descendant of the most honored family in Israel could be. Under the friendly shelter of the Egyptian court he conceived the idea of providing for the Jews in Egypt a temple which would have at its head the rightful high-priest, and would be free from the pollution which had desecrated the holy place in Jerusalem. Sanction for this bold innovation was found, not only in the troubled and uncertain conditions in Judea, but also in a prophecy in Isaiah xix. 19: "In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt."

74. The site selected was that of an old temple ruin in the district of Heliopolis, near the city of Leontopolis. Permission being given by Ptolemy to build, Onias erected here a tower-like structure (J. W. vii. 10, 3) sixty cubits high, and surrounded it by a wall of brick with stone gateways. There is nothing in the form of the structure which shows any desire to imitate the temple-building in Jerusalem. Indeed, the only exact copy of any feature of the Jerusalem temple was the altar itself (J. W. vii. 10, 3). Instead of the seven-branched candlestick, "a single lamp hammered out of a piece of gold illuminated the place with its rays" (J. W. vii. 10, 3). The revenue from a large tract of land was given by Ptolemy for its maintenance. A sufficient number of priests was already at hand, and the regular temple service was established and maintained from about 160 B. C. to 73 A. D., when the temple was closed by the Romans. To this period ten years must be added if Wellhausen's view that the temple in Egypt was established by Onias III. in 170 B. C. be accepted.

75. Questions at once arise regarding this Egyptian temple, not all of which are easy to answer. Had the Hasmoneans failed and the Jerusalem temple been completely destroyed, Judaism might have found its central point of interest in the new shrine at Leontopolis, but the Hasmoneans did not fail. Religious freedom in Judea was never again lost after it was secured by Judas, and, within only a few years after the temple service began in Egypt, Jonathan put on the high-priestly robes. How then did these two temples stand related, and what was the attitude of the Jews in Egypt toward the temple in Jerusalem? Josephus relates, in a passage which must be regarded with some suspicion, that the Jews and the Samaritans argued in Ptolemy's presence "over the question of the title of the temple at Jerusalem and of that on Mount Gerizim to be regarded as the true temple." He states that in this dispute the Jews of Alexandria were "in great concern for those who were to contend for the temple in Jerusalem, for they took it very ill that any should try to take away the reputation of their temple, which was so ancient and celebrated all over the world" (Ant. xiii. 3, 4). There was, therefore, no lack of veneration on the part of the Jews in Egypt for the time-honored seat of worship in Jerusalem. The actual situation seems to have been that, while they rejoiced in a service of their own, they readily acknowledged their obligations to the re-established temple worship in Jerusalem, by contributing the regular tax assessed upon all the Jews of the dispersion and by making, in common with Jews from all lands, pilgrimages to the Holy City.

76. The reason for the building of the Egyptian

temple suggested by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities* (xiii. 3, 1) seems nearer the truth than the motive attributed to Onias in *The Jewish War* (vii. 10, 3). The new temple was to be a place where the Jews of Egypt might meet together in harmony, rather than an expression of the high-priest's wounded vanity. It was set up, not as a mere rival of the Jerusalem temple, but as a compensation for the crippled and profaned worship conducted by such high-priests as Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus. Since prophecy, as popularly interpreted, specifically pointed to this temple, it was long cherished by the Jews in Egypt. At Jerusalem itself it was never regarded with favor. As has already been remarked, it had been in existence for several years before the regular, orderly worship of the Jerusalem temple was restored under Jonathan. It was not easy to condemn its origin when the circumstances were considered, but as Grätz remarks: "The pious could not escape a certain discomfort from the fact that the Heliopolitan temple was in itself a violation of the law of worship, and out of the contradictory feelings toward it—honor in its origin in the stress of the times and discomfort over its unlawful existence—resulted that wavering estimate of it which is expressed in the laws enacted regarding it" (iii. 36). Philo, who greatly honored the temple in Jerusalem, says nothing against the one in Egypt, such regulations as prohibited its priests from officiating at Jerusalem being of later origin. In general it may be said that, while it never attained any real importance for Judaism as a whole, it did tend to increase the separation between the Jews of Palestine and Egypt.

77. Unlike, then, their countrymen dispersed in other lands, the Jews in Egypt had, in addition to the regular services of the synagogue, — that bulwark of faith for the thousands who were away from Jerusalem, — the regular ritual of the temple service, and yet, despite all, “the genius of Egyptian Judaism was not the priestly house of Onias, but the royal house of Ptolemy.” The liberal and enriching policy of the Ptolemies had made Alexandria one of the most brilliant capitals of the ancient world, a royal residence, a commercial metropolis, and a university city, all in one.” The tone, the variety, and the stimulus in its life awakened and fascinated the thoughtful minds of every people within its borders. Here were temples to different divinities, lecture halls for the exposition of diverse philosophies, a library unequalled in literary treasures, and in all was the restless activity of scholars and teachers. No wall, such as enclosed the Jewish quarter, could be high enough to shut out the power and influence of all this from the followers of Moses, earnest and devoted though they might be. Nor did it. The door which had opened wide the way from Jewish seclusion to all this multiform life was the Greek language. So completely had the Jews taken this as their medium of intercourse, not only with the outside world, but among themselves, that they required a translation of their own scriptures into it, which was known as the Septuagint. This noble version itself reveals the influence of “the outer thought” in its interpretative translations (Kent, *History Jewish People*, sect. 284).

78. Two facts, however, need emphasis in order to make clear the character of nearly all the Græco-

Jewish literature from the Septuagint to the writings of Josephus. The first is that the Jews in their separate city-quarter maintained rigidly their own worship and customs; the second, that in Alexandria philosophy first came into contact with revelation. The rights and privileges given the Jews, their own prosperity, due to industry and thrift, and their worth to the ruling powers early made them objects of jealousy to the Greeks and native Egyptians. Jealousy suggested those accusations which aimed at pouring contempt upon this "upstart and exclusive" people who refused to share in the worship of the city and who were limited in their intercourse with the rest of mankind by their prohibitive customs. It was commonly reported that, as a people, they had their origin in a great company of lepers whom a certain priest, called Moses, really Osarsiph, had persuaded into adopting a new religion which he offered them. Their distinguishing customs were defamed and construed as evidences of a real hatred toward all men except Jews (Against Apion ii. 15). The chief framers of all these attacks were the Alexandrian literati; and it was both for purposes of enlightenment and persuasion that the Jews replied, using the literary form of their opponents to set forth the antiquity and worth of their nation. History and poetry as well as direct argumentation were employed to show up the falsehood of the accounts written against them.

79. Only fragments of most of these works have been preserved for us, but they are sufficient to give us some idea of the extent of the acquaintance of the Jews with the literature of the Greeks. When, in the interest of their cause, they can appeal to early

Greek historians, and, further, in the case of some, expand their narratives so as to make them more effective; when, with the same end in view, they can forge verses in the name of the Greek poets, and finally use the Sibyl herself as a means of substantiating their claims, — whatever may be the moral quality of the defence, it certainly reveals more than a superficial knowledge of Greek literature. Granted that all this literature was read with an apologetic interest, it nevertheless, in turn, made its own appeal and exerted its own influence. The Jews were thus brought face to face with questionings and conceptions that were at once noble and profound, and their self-complacency was surprised with teachings which were not far removed from the best utterances of their own sacred books. *The philosophic interest of the Jews.*

80. Especially was this true in the realm of philosophic thought; where the great questions respecting God, the origin of the world and the soul, and the real object of life were discussed with that keenness and care which would awaken the deepest interest of the Jew. The one holy and almighty God of his sacred writings was the Infinite, the one Good, the First Cause of Greek philosophy, and in each case the realities of creation, soul, and life were in keeping with the conception of God. Was there any fundamental relation between these and the God of Genesis? Could the Hebrew Jehovah be commended to the Greek mind? Were the institutions of Moses, when properly understood, in harmony with the teachings of philosophy? These, or questions like them, gave an impulse to that earnest endeavor which was apparent in Judeo-Alexandrian thinking from the time of

Aristobulus to that of Philo,—indeed, which was in operation in all probability from the very beginning of Hellenic Judaism; namely, the reconciliation of philosophy and revelation. While Judaism in Palestine was fighting its way to political independence, there was going steadily forward that process of amalgamation of Jewish conceptions and philosophic interpretations which reached its climax in Philo Judæus.

81. Among the earliest leaders in this movement was Aristobulus, the teacher of Ptolemy Philometor. He was a Jewish priest, and there is no good reason for doubting that he is the one addressed in II. Maccabees i. 10, as "the master of King Ptolemeus." He wrote his Explanation of the Mosaic Laws for Ptolemy himself (170–150 B. C.). Only two fragments of the whole work are preserved for us by Eusebius in his *Preparatio Evangelica*, viii. 10 and xiii. 12. The aim of Aristobulus was to show that the Greek philosophers, and especially the Peripatetics, were dependent upon the laws of Moses and upon the other prophets for their doctrines. Years after Philo echoed this doctrine. In Aristobulus we find the beginnings of that method of allegorical interpretation which in later years became both the characteristic and bane of Alexandrian thinking. He uses it to explain what is meant when the Scripture says that God has hands, arms, face, and feet; that he descended in fire on Sinai, and that he rested on the Sabbath day. The attempt to get behind these forms of statement to what was actually meant by them is the inevitable tendency of reflective minds. Much that Aristobulus gives in the way of interpretation would now find ready acceptance. It is only

*work of
Aristobulus*

when the allegorical explanation transmutes facts into the airy nothings of merely ideal relations that it becomes fanciful and untrustworthy. This extreme is once and again exemplified in Philo. Aristobulus seems to have tried to give, in part at least, a sober explanation of the Mosaic law, but he frequently reveals his Alexandrian training, as when he appeals to Greek philosophers or poets for the substantiation of his interpretations. Verses purporting to come from Orpheus, Hesiod, and Homer, which had been in all probability forged in the interests of Jewish claims, are accepted by Aristobulus in good faith. Indeed, the fragments of his work which have been preserved to us illustrate nearly all the features of the earnest attempt made in Alexandria to harmonize the teachings of the Jewish scriptures with the best conceptions of Greek thought.

82. A work of an entirely different kind, showing in its own way the fusion of Jewish and Greek conceptions, is The Wisdom of Solomon, commonly called The Book of Wisdom. It is the classic of Judeo-Alexandrine literature, and in some respects the most important of the books of the Apocrypha. Its Hellenistic character is revealed not in its allegorical interpretations,—although these are to be found in it,—nor in the literary form in which the truth is presented, for its form follows that of the wisdom literature of the Old Testament. It is rather to be seen in the fact that its broad, noble teachings are given a richer meaning and a wider application by their statement in terms and relations suggested in part by the thinkers of Greece. Interest centres in the views of God, man, and the world, which are the

result of the modification of Hebrew thinking by Greek influences.

83. The book is really *its great theme* a series of discourses upon given texts (i. 1; i. 12; vi. 12; ix. 18; xi. 5), and it contains passages of rare eloquence and beauty (see vii. 22 to viii. 1). Wisdom, divine and human, is its theme; and whether it speaks of it in its relation to God, or as a quality of human life, it is always to glorify its worth and power. In its divine aspect Wisdom is

a breath of the power of God,
And a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty;
Therefore can nothing defiled find entrance into her.
For she is an effulgence from everlasting light,
And an unspotted mirror of the working of God,
And an image of his goodness;
And she, being one, hath power to do all things;
And remaining in herself, reneweth all things (vii. 25-27).

All this is in keeping with the doctrine of Wisdom as found in the books of the Old Testament and in Ecclesiasticus; but it also marks an advance upon their teachings. The conception of the nature, sphere, and operation of Wisdom verges upon that of a distinct, intermediary reality between God and the world; and here the whole doctrine reveals the influence of that speculative trend which culminated in the Logos-teaching of Philo. *wisdom in relation to God.*

84. It is clear that there is no separable existence of Wisdom predicated, but only such a setting forth of her relation to God as constitutes a preparation for the later revelations of the New Testament, making some of the terms used accurately applicable to the

position and dignity of Christ (Wis. vii. 26; Heb. i. 3). In one instance Wisdom is identified with the Spirit of God, "pervading and penetrating all things by reason of her pureness" (i. 7; xii. 1; vii. 24); in another with the Word (ix. 1, 2), and in another with the divine Power or Justice or with Providence. Wisdom, in whom was an "understanding spirit" (vii. 22), was the architect of the world, and that too out of "matter without form" (xi. 17), — a statement notable, as are others in the book, for the forms of expression which have been taken from Greek philosophy and used to clothe ideas which are Jewish in substance. This reveals again the place which this book occupies in that line of development which was preparing the medium of truth for the revelations of the truth itself. It is in a sense true that the Greek language itself would not have been fully ready for the teachings of the New Testament had not Judaism in part worked out its mission in Alexandria.

85. Inclusive as the term Wisdom is on the human side in the earlier Wisdom books, it is here given a far wider range. A knowledge of nature which is the outcome of a scientific interest in her factors and laws; an understanding of history which grasps the purpose lying behind its ceaseless succession of events; a comprehension of the meaning of life which issues from a firm belief in immortality with its blessedness or woe, — all these are made part of that wisdom which, as far as man is concerned, has its root in "the fear of the Lord" and its sure unfolding through communion with him. In a great variety of ways the blessings which she will confer upon man are set forth. She will be to him a counsellor in good things, a comfort

The comprehensiveness of the term on its human side

in cares and grief, a source of honor and fame, and, above all, a means of gaining immortal life (viii.).

Without her man is only "ignorant, feeble, sensuous, unspiritual." *Teachings of the book about body & the life beyond.*

86. It has with truth been said that "the book marks the highest point of religious knowledge attained by the Jews in the period between the close of the old Testament canon and the beginning of the Gospel dispensation." Its teaching regarding the life beyond is of surprising clearness and force (v. 14, 15). Its conception of God has in it the light of such truth as this: "Thou lovest all the things that are and abhorrest nothing which thou hast made: for never wouldst thou have formed anything if thou hadst hated it. And how would anything have endured if it had not been thy will, or been preserved if not called into existence by thee? But thou sparest all: for they are thine, O Lord, thou lover of souls" (xi. 24-26). Its doctrine of the soul is moulded by teachings foreign to the Old Testament. "The immortality of the soul," a phrase neither Judaistic nor Christian, but virtually Platonic, expresses exactly its hope for the future. The body is a weight and perishable. The pre-existent soul came into it and at last shall be freed from it as from a prison (viii. 20; ix. 15). There is no trace of a teaching of the resurrection of the body in the book. Wisdom saves the soul, bringing it at last to the ineffable glory of God's own presence. Such in merest outline is the character of this remarkable book. To faithful Jews in trial and depression it brought the richest comfort and hope. To those, whether Jews or Gentiles, who went the way of "folly," it spoke its solemn warnings, and commended with zealous earn-

estness the blessings of Wisdom both for this life and the life to come. *The message of the Sibyl*

87. About the time when the name of Solon was used to commend "the Wisdom which saves" to all who would receive it and especially to heathen rulers, another striking method was employed to reach the minds and hearts of the Gentiles. The Sibyl, that strange, exceptional, semi-divine prophetess of the will of the heathen gods, was made to speak for and about the chosen people and by her message to win men to the faith. It was a clever device. The mystery attached to the whole activity of the Sibyl, and the fact that her oracles were commonly kept carefully guarded, only added to the interest of such words as could be heard or read. The Sibylline Oracles, which are "Jewish and Christian works under a heathen mask," are contained in fourteen books of widely different dates and of varied authorship. They have no inner connection, and extend far down into the Christian period. That part of them which came from Egypt and the period under consideration is found in Book III., which may be reasonably dated about 140 B. C. The Sibyl speaks in hexameters and in the language of Homer. *within III Mac. 75*

88. Beginning with line ninety-seven, where this *Sibylline* third book really commences, a rapid review of man's *speeches & the purpose of the book.* history is given from the building of the tower of Babel to the rise of the Romans (97-161). At this point prophecy begins and its word is concerning the Græco-Macedonian and Roman kingdoms, and concerning the sovereignty of the people of God, who shall come to power after the seventh king of Hellenistic origin shall have ruled over Egypt. The vision of the rulership of Israel and of the attendant judg-

ment of evil nations leads the seer to sketch the character and history of the Jewish people from the exodus to the time of Cyrus (162-294). Then follow declarations of judgment and disaster which are to come to various nations and cities, and against the darkness is thrown the bright promise of Messianic prosperity and peace (295-380). Once more the stern word of judgment is uttered against various peoples of the Hellenic world, and then, after the prediction of a great final judgment, follows the promise of a Messianic kingdom and glory (380-807). This third book is itself a collection of disconnected oracles. They have, however, one common purpose, and this is seen in the earnest admonitions against idolatry and the repeated exhortations to come within the range of the promises made to God's chosen people. By history and prophecy alike the certainty of judgment upon the ungodly is made clear, and the bright hope of the days of the Messiah is given all possible attractiveness that it may win men to Israel's faith. Never before had the Sibyl spoken a message which made such an appeal to the highest, truest interests of men. The Judaism of Alexandria in its contact with the thought of the world had by no means lost its earnest spirit or its saving faith.

7

VII

THE HAPPY DAYS OF SIMON'S REIGN

89. SHORT as was the rule of Simon, it was nevertheless marked by a brilliancy that completed the glory of the Maccabean house. Though his hair was gray when the full responsibilities of leadership were put into his hands, his glowing zeal, unremitting energy, and clever diplomacy succeeded in achieving the independence for which Jonathan and he had long toiled and fought. To be sure, Demetrius had given him rights and powers which seem of little value when one thinks of the giver as an exiled king; but Simon acted as though they had come to him from the throne itself and lost no time in securing their full actualization. The troubles of Syria itself left him free to attend to the needs of his own government. The first requirement was complete possession of his dominions. Gazara, at the foot of the mountains and commanding the road from Joppa to Jerusalem, Bethsur, menacing the road from the south, and the citadel in Jerusalem, were yet held by the Hellenists. In order to secure an open road to the coast and make most serviceable the port of Joppa, Simon turned his attention first to the siege of Gazara. By means of a movable tower the place was quickly brought to terms. After the inhabitants were driven out and the city purged of all traces of heathenism, Simon placed in charge

"such men as would keep the law," and strengthened its fortifications. Next Bethsur yielded, and then, at last, the citadel at Jerusalem, which had so long been closely besieged. By the help of the wall which Jonathan had built (sect. 67), the garrison was starved into surrender. It is not difficult to imagine the rejoicing in Jerusalem on that day in May, 142 B. C., when "with thanksgiving and branches of palm-trees, and with harps and cymbals, and with viols and hymns and songs" the festal procession entered the old fortress that for twenty-six years had disturbed the peace of the city. For a time the day of this triumph was annually kept as a festival (I. Mac. xiii. 43-48).

90. Simon was now in possession of all the strongholds of Judea. Owing to the apparent disagreement between the statements of First Maccabees and Josephus, there is some doubt as to what was actually done with the citadel. Josephus declares that Simon razed the fortress to the ground and then levelled the hill on which it stood, so that the temple should never again be in danger of an attack from a commanding elevation. Three years of constant labor were required to complete this task, which materially changed the aspect of the city, since the cuttings from the hill were used to fill in the valley lying between it and the temple mount (Ant. xiii. 6, 7; J. W. v. 4). The reasonableness of Josephus's version is evident; but the work of destruction could not have been undertaken immediately after the capture of the citadel, for Simon retained the fortress as one of his defences in the city, keeping there a garrison of Jewish soldiers (I. Mac. xiv. 37). It is probable that the work was

done later in Simon's time, and that Josephus's account is a sort of summary of the policy of Simon in regard to Jewish strongholds. If this is not the true explanation, the account of Josephus is unhistorical, and the whole work belongs, as Schürer maintains, to the reign of another ruler. The significant fact was the capture of the citadel. When this was accomplished, Simon stood at the zenith of Jewish triumph. The Hellenists were compelled to seek refuge in Alexandria or Syria, unless, indeed, they quietly accepted the new conditions. Those who would neither flee nor submit were put to death. Appointing his son John, "a valiant man," captain of all his hosts, Simon devoted his attention to the management of the civil and religious affairs of the nation. The brief sentences of First Maccabees present a picture of the internal condition of Israel at this happy time. At the head of the nation stood a man whose wise, beneficent counsels were ever for its good. This fact is really the explanation of the whole record that follows, which glorifies this leader. It is easy to understand how it could be said that "his reign was one of the happiest periods ever experienced in Israel."

91. The port which Judea held at this time had only recently come into her possession. Even though Jonathan had taken Joppa, the ugly fortress of Gazara in the Shephelah hills, had made the trade route to the sea unsafe. Now the road was open, and Simon made it one of his first duties by extensive improvements to prepare the harbor for intercourse with "the isles of the sea." A basis was thus established for a maritime trade, and Judea invited to her borders the commerce of the Mediterranean. Wher-

ever and whenever he heard of Jewish captives, he redeemed them from prisons and strange cities and restored them to their native land. They came back to the quiet and rest of peace under which the land itself was renewed by the hand of the husbandman and of the vine-dresser. The rocky hills of Judea soon tell the tale, either of neglect or of cultivation. War had made them desolate. Now the terraced hill-sides and the fruitful valleys once more gave their increase. The whole picture reminds the Jewish historian of that description from the prophet in which the blessings of the Messianic times are set forth. Old men sit in the streets communing together of good things, and the young men display in pardonable pride the equipment of the soldier, — heroes, indeed, in the villages and towns to which they had come back from "the wars." There is no fear in the village street, for the land is free. "Every man sits under his vine and his fig-tree, and there is none to make them afraid." Those who had suffered in the rigor of days gone by were especial objects of Simon's care, and so, too, all who were now oppressed. The day of blessing was for those who had been faithful to the law; while he who despised it or neglected it was "taken away." Life throughout the land was full of joy; and when the people went up to the temple, they saw there also the beneficent work of their leader, for "he beautified the sanctuary and multiplied the vessels needed in its service" (I. Mac. xiv. 4-15).

92. It is not strange that the people were ready to express in formal decree their appreciation of the noble results that had been achieved. In September, 141 B. C., in the third year of Simon's reign, a great

assembly of the priests, leaders, and people, which was held in the great court of the temple, resolved that Simon should be civil governor, military chief, and high-priest "forever until there should arise a faithful prophet." The honor was complete; it included the headship of all the spheres of national activity, and it made the exalted office hereditary. Simon, by the will of the nation, was virtually placed in the position of sovereign. It will be understood that he had exercised all these powers hitherto. He now received the formal sanction of the people with the additional right to hand down these honors to his children. As a mark of the exalted character of his leadership, it was further decreed that all contracts should be made in his name, and that he should "be clothed in purple and wear gold." These decrees, accompanied by a review of Simon's services to the nation, were engraved on tablets of brass and placed in a conspicuous place in the temple. It is doubtful if ever before such honor was given by the Jews to one of their rulers. It marks the climax in the career of the Maccabees (I. Mac. xiv. 25-49).

93. The reign of Simon was characterized by two important political acts, — his embassy to Rome and his coinage of money. The light of after events makes the repeated appeals of the Maccabees to Rome seem like a fatal hallucination; but their policy is to be judged rather in the light of the times. Certainly Syria was a constant cause of anxiety, and the only power whose authority was recognized and feared by her was that of Rome. Simon, therefore, followed in the footsteps of his brothers in seeking to draw the Romans into closer bonds of friendship. He sent an

embassy headed by Numenius to ask confirmation of the league made with them in earlier days, and, as a token of good-will, they carried with them "a great shield of gold of a thousand pound weight." The mission was in every way successful. After courteous treatment of them, the Senate placed in their hands a decree granting all that they sought. Letters were sent to Egypt, Syria, Pergamum, Cappadocia, and to many small independent states and cities, warning them against making war upon the Jews, or ever assisting those who might engage in hostilities with them, and commanding them to give up all fugitives to Simon, to be punished in accordance with the Jewish law. Copies of these letters were sent to Simon. Holtzmann calls our attention to the fact that we have here the first great attempt to restrict the blending of the Jews with the nations among which they were dispersed, on the ground of a jurisdiction which pertained to them as well as to those in Judea, and which was to be recognized by foreign peoples. Not only a religious but also a legal bond was to hold them in inseparable connection with the fatherland (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii. 378). The recognition by the Romans made more evident the unity of this widely scattered people, and at the same time gave a Jew in foreign lands a new sense of dignity. Thus was the light of the bright days of Simon's administration reflected upon the Jews in all lands (I. Mac. xiv. 24; xv. 15-24).

94. The other distinctive feature of Simon's reign, the coinage of money, is first referred to in the letter of Antiochus of Syria to Simon, asking his help toward the regaining of his throne, 140-139 B. C. (I. Mac.

xv. 6). The right of making coins was generally recognized in antiquity as a mark of sovereignty. This privilege, therefore, gave new emphasis to the independence of Judea. It is to be noted, however, that Simon coined money before he was offered the privilege by Antiochus. This he did for only one year, but the act shows clearly his own conception of his position. Of this coinage there are extant silver shekels and half-shekels, with the words, "Shekel of Israel" on one side around a cup or chalice, and on the other the words, "Jerusalem the Holy," about a central device which is interpreted as Aaron's rod. Their dates range through five years of Simon's leadership, 141-140 to 137-136 B. C. The fact that Antiochus, soon after the granting of the privilege of coining money, "broke all the covenants," left Simon to act largely on his own responsibility in regard to the coinage. Thus with all the marks of a king, save the name, Simon ruled in Israel. There could be no king again until the Messiah should come, but this governor, this prince in Judea, could ask no larger recognition than was given him. For a few years these peaceful conditions continued, but Syria was too near and her internal discords too constant to allow a lengthened respite. Once more came the call to war.

95. After his alliance with Simon, Demetrius II., in order to get help against Tryphon, made an expedition into the East. The Parthians had overrun the eastern provinces of the Syrian kingdom and were detested by the inhabitants, who already had sent several embassies to Demetrius, asking him to come and lead them against their common enemy; but the first promise of success was, at length, lost in the

*much trouble in
Syria in which
Simon was
involved.*

capture of Demetrius through treachery in 138 B. C. During this time Tryphon had held possession of Syria, though Cleopatra, the wife of Demetrius II., had maintained her husband's cause at Seleucia. Now that he was a prisoner in Parthia, she invited Antiochus, the brother of her husband, who was named Sidetes from a town in Pamphylia, where he had been brought up, to join with her in driving out Tryphon. He consented so fully as to make himself at once the claimant of the Syrian throne. At this point the history again touches that of Judea, for Antiochus made advances to Simon, confirming him in all he had received, and promising still greater honors if he would support him. Two thousand men were sent to help in the siege of Dora, on the coast just below Carmel, but so completely had the tide of affairs turned against Tryphon that Sidetes, though he had taken provisions, declined to receive the troops and broke faith with Simon. His sudden success led him to the determination to bring Judea again into submission. Accordingly he sent a certain Athenobius to Jerusalem, demanding the surrender of Joppa, Gazara, and the citadel, or in lieu of them five hundred talents of silver, and another five hundred for payment of damages and tribute.

96. Simon's reply was brief and pointed. The most he would allow was one hundred talents. In anger, Sidetes, as soon as he was relieved of Tryphon, sent an army into Judea. Cendebeus, the general of this force, took his position near Jamnia and began a war of petty inroad along different routes leading out from his encampment. The exasperated Simon committed the task of punishing this bad faith and

insolence to his two sons, Jonathan and Judas, and faithfully they executed it. The Syrian army was so disastrously defeated that Antiochus did not again in Simon's lifetime attempt an invasion.

97. This episode shows how near Judea was to trouble and danger. Any disaffection within her own borders was sure of sympathy in Antioch, while the undefined relation of her government to that of the Syrian court made her the tempting object of every successful adventurer's cupidity. It is probable that the fruitless expedition of Cendebeus, and the treachery at Jericho of Ptolemy, the trusted son-in-law of Simon, were due to a suggestion of Antiochus to the effect that the removal of Simon would be looked upon in Antioch as a highly meritorious deed. The hope of support and reward from the Syrian court alone explains how such a shameless traitor as Ptolemy, the son of Abubus, could murder his honored and generous father-in-law and defy the nation. It certainly was a kind of attack against which Simon could in no way prepare himself, and unsuspectingly he went to the banquet which Ptolemy had prepared for him at Docus, a stronghold near Jericho. The aged ruler was on one of his tours of inspection through the country and took with him to Docus his two sons, Mattathias and Judas. In the midst of the banquet they were all murdered.

98. A fitting close to this noble life would have been a quiet death amid the happy conditions which he had done so much to bring about; but this was denied him, as it had been to Judas and Jonathan. With the account of his death the First Book of Maccabees comes to a close. It has carried us through

the heroic struggles of Mattathias and of his stalwart sons; from Modein to Jerusalem; from the decree of Antiochus Epiphanes, devoting the Jews to extermination unless they would become apostates, to the decree which made the last of the Maccabean sons the prince of Israel; from the threatening ascendancy of Hellenism to the supremacy of Judaism. It has also faithfully given us the shadow touches in the whole picture, so that we are not left to strange surprise in the later unfoldings of Judean history. The points of possible reaction are not concealed. Like some noble tree in the splendor of its summer foliage, at whose heart forces are working which shall bring its stately form to the ground, so stood Judea in the glory of Simon's reign, but within her, too, were forces destined to work her disaster.

quint

VIII

TERRITORIAL EXPANSION UNDER JOHN HYRCANUS

99. It was part of Ptolemy's nefarious plan to take the life of John, the third son of Simon, and commander in Gazara; but a timely warning saved the prince to a long and distinguished leadership in Judea, 135-105 B. C. John, known by the name of Hyrcanus, has often been compared to Solomon in the character of his reign, and, in two particulars at least, the comparison is striking; namely, in the extent of the kingdom over which he reigned, and in the sharp antithesis of his strong, peaceful rulership to the times of trouble and unrest which preceded and followed it. The same deed that made him ruler deprived him of father, mother, and two brothers, and ranked him as the foe of Antiochus Sidetes; but the blood of the Hasmoneans was in his veins and he had been trained by one who knew how to govern and fight. It was wholly in accord with the desire of the people that he became high-priest and ruler; and Jerusalem gave him a warm welcome. His first duty was to punish the murderer of his father. Ptolemy, after his act of treachery, attempted to make himself master of the capital; but failing, retired to his fortress at Docus. Here Hyrcanus besieged him but was deterred from capturing the fortress because Ptolemy threatened to throw the mother of Hyrcanus headlong from the

walls if an assault was made. The return of the Sabbathical year necessitated a rest from war, and thus gave Ptolemy an opportunity to escape. After murdering the mother of Hyrcanus, he fled to Philadelphia, where he disappeared forever.

100. Hardly was this trouble past, when word came that Sidetes was on the march from Syria with a large army. The refusals and victory of Simon had not been forgotten. Instead of meeting the foe in the mountains, as Judas would have done, Hyrcanus shut himself up in Jerusalem, and soon the city was surrounded. Hyrcanus relied upon the walls for defence and upon sallies against the besiegers; Sidetes planned to starve the Jews into surrender. To this end he surrounded the city "with seven camps" and at all places of possible exit doubled his guard. The siege was long protracted and brought the Jews to desperate straits. All who could not bear weapons were sent out of the city, but even they could not get past the Syrian lines, and many of them perished between the two forces. At last, on the occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles, Hyrcanus asked Sidetes for a truce of seven days, that the people might observe the feast. The request is an evidence of the religious fidelity of the Jews. This feast was usually one of great rejoicing; it could have been anything but that now. Their loyalty to faith seemed commendable to Sidetes, who in reality was one of the better Syrian monarchs, and he sent with his compliance gifts for sacrifice in the temple. The gates were opened to all who had been sent out, and Hyrcanus took the opportunity of approaching Sidetes with terms of peace. The Syrian king was ready to listen, and it was finally agreed

that the Jews should deliver up their arms, pay tribute for Joppa, and the other cities which bordered upon Judea, give him hostages, and in addition pay five hundred talents of silver. Two things are notable in the conference which resulted in this agreement. One was the rejection by Sidetes of the counsel offered by the extremists in his camp, who wanted the Jews destroyed; the other, the refusal of the Jews to allow a garrison to be placed again in Jerusalem. The wisdom of Sidetes saved him from another Maccabean uprising; the firmness of the Jews freed them from the plague of an enemy within their very doors. With three hundred of the promised talents, and the son of Hyrcanus among the hostages, Sidetes withdrew from Judea, having attended to the demolition of the walls of Jerusalem before his departure (*Ant.* xiii. 8, 2-3).

101. In this settlement an influence was active which is not referred to in the pages of Josephus, the Roman Senate. Just such a situation as that in which the Jews were placed warranted the interference of the Romans, for they had expressly warned the nations against making war upon Judea (see sect. 93). Hyrcanus sent an embassy to remind them of their agreement (*Ant.* xiii. 9, 2). This embassy asked that Joppa, and Gazara, and "several other cities which Antiochus had taken from them in war," should be given back, and "that whatever had been decreed by Antiochus during the war, without the consent of the Senate, might be made void." As this account stands in Josephus, it seems to follow the close of the war; but it must be placed some time before the surrender at Jerusalem, for Antiochus VII. is the only Antiochus who could have taken from the

Jews, in the time of Hyrcanus, the cities of Joppa and Gazara. These were captured, in all probability, on the march of Antiochus to Jerusalem. The Romans promised to gratify the Jews, but because of troublesome affairs of their own, delayed attending to the matter. Later Hyrcanus sent another embassy, which secured from the Senate peremptory orders that all towns taken by Antiochus should be restored (Ant. xiv. 10, 22). The command was too explicit to be disobeyed, hence Antiochus contented himself with tribute and hostages (Schürer i. 1, 227). The final outcome represented a victory for the Jews, although the return to the position of dependence was humiliating.

102. The new arrangement gave assurance of continued peace, for there was far more likelihood of returning misfortune if the hated Syrians were altogether excluded from the land. Tribute could be paid until the Jews found an opportunity to refuse; and the tangled interests at Antioch might make that at any moment possible. They soon did so. The friendly feeling between Antiochus and Hyrcanus, at the time of the armistice for the feast, continued after the capitulation, and Hyrcanus accompanied the Syrian king on an expedition into Parthia. Here Antiochus lost his life, 128 B. C., and Demetrius II., who was released from prison when Antiochus invaded Parthia, hastened back to Antioch to seize the throne. With his return begins a series of events in Syria, whose chief interest is in the fact that it gave Hyrcanus ample opportunity to re-establish himself in power. The Syrians appealed to Ptolemy VII. against Demetrius, and Alexander Zabinas was placed on the throne. He in turn was overthrown by Antiochus VIII., the

son of Demetrius, who ruled quietly for eight years, and then was obliged to give up the throne to Antiochus IX. After this king had reigned two years, Antiochus VIII. again gained possession of the greater part of Syria, made his place of residence in Coele-Syria, and ruled until 95 B. C. (Ant. xiii. 8, 4; 9, 3; 10, 1). Hyrcanus was practically independent. After the death of Sidetes, he neither paid taxes nor gave much attention to the affairs of Syria, but devoted all of his energy to the building up of the strength of Judea. Taking advantage of the troubles in Syria, he first gave his attention to securing the land against his immediate neighbors on the north, east, and south. They were always ready, not only to help an invading army, but also themselves to throw all possible hindrances in the way of Judea's progress. They must now either be driven out or put under subjection.

103. To carry out his large plans, Hyrcanus, first among the Jewish princes, engaged foreign troops. His policy of conquest soon awakened strong opposition in the nation. The employment of foreign mercenaries made the entire project even more unpopular. The inseparable relation between political independence and religious freedom, however, justified Hyrcanus in his efforts. He set out first for the region across the Jordan. Medeba, which had already shown its hostility (sect. 54), was taken after a trying siege of six months, and then Samega (El Sâmik), probably situated just east of the ancient Heshbon. The army then recrossed the Jordan and captured Shechem, destroying at the same time the temple on Mount Gerizim. For nearly three hundred years this temple

had been the rallying point of the schismatical worship of the Samaritans. Unlike the Onias temple in Egypt, it had been a claimant for the sole right of existence. It was a defiant and intolerant rival of the sanctuary at Jerusalem. The day of its destruction was, therefore, a day of great rejoicing in Judea. It was also a fateful day for the Samaritans themselves, for it took from them the very centre and support of their religious life, and although they continued for many years their separate worship, a shadow then fell upon them which only deepened with time.

104. The southern border of the land yet needed attention, since along it an ancient and persistent enemy, the Idumeans, held possession. Judas Maccabeus had been compelled to war against them because of their determined enmity, and Hyrcanus now felt himself strong enough to put an end to their aggressions. He captured Marissa and Adora, and was soon afterward in a position to offer the Idumeans the choice of exile, or the acceptance of Judaism, by submitting to circumcision and the obligations of the law. They were so anxious to remain "in the country of their forefathers" that they took the latter alternative and were circumcised (Ant. xiii. 9, 1). This was a high-handed method of conquest, and "the Judeans soon found to their painful cost how dangerous it is to allow religious zeal to degenerate into the spirit of arbitrary conversion. The enforced union of the sons of Edom with the sons of Jacob was fraught with disaster to the latter. It was through the Idumeans and the Romans that the Hasmonean dynasty was overthrown and the Judean nation destroyed" (Grätz).

105. Hyrcanus now had a season of rest from military expeditions. He ruled in undisturbed possession over a comparatively large and prosperous kingdom. Numerous copper coins attest the independence of the nation and the honored position of Hyrcanus, for he is the first Jewish prince whose name was stamped upon them. As far as his foreign relations were concerned, he would have passed all the remainder of his days in peace had it not been for the Samaritans, who were restless under Jewish control. At the bidding of the Syrian kings, they had wronged the Idumean settlers whom Hyrcanus had planted in Samaria (Ant. xiii. 10, 2). He determined to teach them a lesson, and laid siege to the city of Samaria. A trench and a double wall were carried around the city and the conduct of the siege committed to his sons, Antigonus and Aristobulus. The Samaritans first appealed to Antiochus Cyzicenus, who tried to help them, but he was defeated and pursued as far as Scythopolis. As their distress became desperate, they called again upon Antiochus, who procured further help from Ptolemy Lathurus, and with these forces devastated the country in the hope of forcing Hyrcanus to raise the siege. Antiochus again failed and then left two of his generals to carry on the campaign. One of these proved to be a rash leader and was defeated; the other, a traitor, who, from love of money, betrayed Scythopolis and other places near it to the Jews. Thus ended all hope for Samaria. The city capitulated and was utterly destroyed. These victories carried the northern boundary of the kingdom to a line running from Mount Carmel on the west to Scythopolis and the Jordan on the east (Ant. xiii. 10, 2, 3). Well might

Hyrcanus claim the honor which the nation as a whole was ready to give him and which history has declared his due. A glance back over the years to the time when Judas fled to the mountains, and when only the caves and fastnesses were safe dwelling-places for the faithful, reveals what had been gained. Now Idumea, a large part of the coast line, Samaria, and the eastern bank of the Jordan were subject to the court at Jerusalem. Judea had become a state worthy of respect among the nations.

IX

INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND THE GROWTH OF PARTIES

106. ALL this expansion of territory involved wider interests of a secular character. Men, measures, and means were required for its supervision and care. To be a high-priest giving undivided attention to religious duties was one thing; it was quite another to have joined to one's high-priestly functions the administration of an extended and diversified kingdom. We have already seen how the ambition for religious freedom merged into the larger and more worldly ambition for political independence. This change brought about inevitably a state of mind which, while not denying the purpose and value of the law, gave room and, indeed, preference to interests that were not purely legal. Alliances with foreign powers, the acquisition of strategic strongholds in order to open highways to Jerusalem, the subjugation of contiguous, hostile provinces for the same reason, — all had a religious bearing. Church and state were one in Judea. Furthermore, these achievements also affected such worldly interests as trade, home industry, military service, and diplomacy. In so far as life under the law insisted upon attention only to the ritual of worship, ceremonial purification, and the study of the law itself, it was out of sympathy with statecraft, except in so far as this might be indispensable to the attainment of these

purely religious aims. A government existent solely for the purpose of protecting and furthering religious interests, and for guarding and promoting the interpretation of the law, was the ideal of the Hasideans. They were heart and soul with Judas and Jonathan in all their courageous struggles toward the establishment of such a protecting and fostering power in Judea. To them all the religious interests of the nation were for a time supreme; but as the Jewish armies were successful and the interests of Judea widened in the dawning independence, new ambitions filled the hearts of the Hasmonean princes, while the Hasideans drew back. They could not and would not follow the Maccabean leaders in their endeavors for political supremacy and political freedom. These were beyond the bounds of their ideals. They gave up the sword to take again the roll and the stylus and measure all duties and ambitions by the standard of the law. Slowly and surely the breach widened between these zealous "separatists" and the rulers of the state.

107. The name "Pharisees" first appears in Jonathan's time, and it was in his reign that the forward movement toward political independence made rapid strides (Ant. xiii. 5, 9). The two facts have an inner connection. Much had been done by both Jonathan and Simon of which the Pharisees could not approve, and the secularizing policy of Hyrcanus brought matters to a crisis. To the party of the Pharisees the high-priesthood of these successive princes must have been very offensive, for the Hasmoneans even though possibly connected with Aaron through the sons of Joarib were not in the direct line of descent; and when in the estimate of Hyrcanus the glory of his political sovereignty was

greater than his high-priestly honor, the time for open and public disapproval came. The party of the Pharisees stepped out into the light of history and became one of the most potent factors in the destiny of the nation. Their power lay in their religious zeal, which commended them to the people. Their earnest, punctilious endeavor to observe completely the requirements of the law and the traditions kept before the eyes of the people the ideal which God demanded of every Israelite. They embodied the spirit of that Judaism which came into being through the teachings of the scribes. Hence, though they were in their own attitude far from democratic, they were in reality the spiritual guides of the people. From these facts it is evident that the Pharisees were not a political party. It was only the exigencies of the times that brought them into political relations. They opposed one leader and sided with another; but the determining issue was ever the requirement of the law.

108. In their doctrine of Providence, they found support for their standard of action. The destiny of the state, as of the individual, was independent of human effort. It was in the hands of God. Man is, indeed, responsible for the moral quality of his actions, but the outcome of human activity is beyond him. God is omnipotent, yet man is so far free as to be responsible for his conduct. The mystery of this they did not attempt to resolve, but they put strong emphasis upon the guiding and determining power of God (Ant. xiii. 5, 9; xviii. 1-3; J. W. ii. 8, 14), hence "vain was the war horse and useless the mighty host of battle, but God's eye kept watch over his faithful ones to rescue them from death." Such a doctrine of

God's watchful care had had splendid demonstrations in the success of Israel against the armies of Syria, but it was no easier then than now to harmonize it with the inequalities and apparent injustice of life, and so the Pharisees looked to the life after death for the adjustment of present limitations and wrongs.

109. In their teaching regarding the future life, they pressed with earnestness the teaching of individual retribution (Ant. xviii. 1, 3; J. W. ii. 8, 14). In that other world the righteous soul shall have its reward and the wicked shall meet the consequences of its wrong-doing. In this significant doctrine they were the representatives of the genuine Judaism of their own and of later times. Already the Book of Daniel had declared that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. xii. 2), and the writer of the Book of Enoch, whose purpose was likewise to bring comfort and cheer to the struggling few of the days of the Maccabean uprising, presents a like conception of future adjustments (90, 20-26, 33). They also had part in the Messianic expectations which were revived in the days of the Maccabees, and which became the theme of apocalypse, and the hope of the individual as well as of the nation. Here, too, their conceptions determined their attitude toward the state. When one remembers that in the fulfilment of the law, and in their bright hopes for the future, are compassed the vital factors of the religion of their day, it becomes clear why and how the Pharisees secured and kept the spiritual leadership of the people down through Roman and Herodian times. The externality and formality which resulted from the

attempt to satisfy the law, and the nationalistic conception which gathered about the thought of the Messiah, gave Jesus occasion for stern denunciation, but, after all, at the word of the Pharisees, the people hurried him off to crucifixion.

110. Over against the Pharisees stood the Sadducees. As an organized party they too were an outcome of the Maccabean struggles and triumphs. They, also, had been vitally interested in the success of Judaism, but because of their ambitions and duties they did not give such close attention to the requirements of the hour as did their opponents. It is not probable that at their first appearance they had a fully developed philosophy of life. That came as the logical result of their position in the community. They were, as Josephus tells us, of the aristocratic class. They had been at the head of affairs in the state, had come into contact with foreign ideas, and had amassed wealth (Ant. xiii. 10, 6; xviii. 1, 4). They put political interests first, and found in the nation's growth in power and influence their highest satisfaction. In all probability they took their name from the house of Zadok, an ancient and honored priestly family, and a centre around which aristocratic forces might gather. It is but natural that with their secular interests should come a worldly spirit. They had but little sympathy with the rigid demand that religion should be the motive and measure of all action. It is precisely the same general position which opened the ranks of the priesthood in earlier days to the incoming of the most decided Hellenism. The Maccabean struggle had driven out of the land all apostates. The Sadducees honored the law, but they refused to consider the traditions of the elders obligatory. In

short, they turned their backs upon all that the scribes had accomplished either in the way of oral additions to the law, or in the development of religious views. Their faith rested upon the *written law*, and they could find no sanction in their accepted scripture for the doctrine of a resurrection of the body, or of retribution in another world, as did later Judaism. They therefore rejected both (Ant. xviii. 1, 4; J. W. ii. 8, 14).

111. Josephus, who himself was a Pharisee, insists that they taught such a doctrine of free-will as to shut out all co-operation of Divine Providence in human activity and to leave man entirely the arbiter of his own course and destiny (Ant. xiii. 5, 9; J. W. ii. 8, 14). It has been rightly questioned whether this is just the truth. The Old Testament does not so clearly teach immortality and individual retribution, in the Pharisaic interpretation of them, as to make the Sadducees contradict the authority on which they relied in denying these doctrines; but the same cannot be said of the denial of Providence. That teaching is plainly enforced in the Old Testament. How could they reject it altogether? Is not the truth rather that they gave emphasis to human freedom as against the overstatements by the Pharisees respecting God's care and guidance? "God helps those who help themselves." The Sadducees were ready to "help themselves" by alliance with foreign powers, mercenary troops, and subjugated frontiers, where the Pharisees would have said, "Let God help!"

112. In their views regarding the existence of angels and evil spirits the two parties also stood opposed; but here again it is probable that the disbelief of the Sadducees was rather in regard to the later and devel-

oped forms of these teachings. Their whole doctrinal position gave them liberty to follow their desires for political power and worldly satisfaction. Hence they had a deeper interest in sustaining the power of the reigning prince than in maintaining the observances of Moses. At a later time they went so far as to be willing, for the sake of power, to accommodate themselves even to Pharisaic views (Ant. xx. 9, 1). They made, however, the open door through which Greek influences came back into the land, and, as another has tersely said, "the antagonism between them and the Pharisees was really a secondary version of the old feud between the Hellenists and the Hasideans." These two parties made the "inner contradiction" which at last left the Maccabean state at the mercy of foreign foes.

113. While they were striving with each other for attainment of their ends and ideals, a third "sect" was quietly seeking the realization of the highest religious purity and holding itself aloof from all interest in either civil or social life. This was the sect of the Essenes. Its origin is one of the perplexing problems in the religious history of the Jews. The name probably signifies "pious," and that view of them which sees in them a refined or superlative Phariseeism is, in all likelihood, the true one; but some of the requirements of their ultra-purification surely did not originate on Jewish soil. In its most flourishing period the number of the Essenes was not large, — about four thousand, — and as a sect its whole career is of interest solely as a religious phenomenon. It did not enter into vital relations with the national life as did the Sadducees and Pharisees. In common with the latter, it was rigid in its observance of the law, and punctili-

ous in its care for ceremonial cleanness. To secure this ceremonial cleanness, it was organized into a community with definite initiatory and probationary requirements for membership extending over a period of three years. All the members dressed in white, dwelt in special houses, possessed their goods in common, took their meals together, and exercised toward each other brotherly care in sickness and need. They were virtually a monastic order, sworn to secrecy regarding their peculiar doctrines. The day's routine was made up of prayer in the early morning, work in the fields or at their crafts until the fifth hour, purifying ablutions preparatory to the common meal which had been made ready by their priest-cooks, further work in the fields until the evening meal, for which preparation was made as for that at the fifth hour, then an evening of study, or of intercourse with strangers who came to them (J. W. ii. 8, 5). They would not engage in trade, nor would they hold slaves, and they condemned oaths, marriage, and animal sacrifices. Much in their theology was the same as in that of the Pharisees. They surpassed the latter, however, in the emphasis which they laid upon the doctrine of Providence. Indeed, they were supposed to have a wonderful knowledge of God's future purposes with regard to men. Josephus gives us several instances of this knowledge (J. W. i. 3, 5; ii. 7, 3; Ant. xv. 10, 5). In their doctrine of man they differed radically from Jewish orthodoxy. They taught the pre-existence as well as immortality of the soul and denied the resurrection of the body (J. W. ii. 8, 11). Stranger than all, they prayed to the sun (J. W. ii. 8, 5), and were careful that its bright light should in no way be polluted.

114. Granting that Josephus has given us a correct account of this strange combination of customs and teachings, the question at once arises, What was its origin? Our answer really turns upon the trustworthiness of Josephus. If this is questioned, we must then seek to explain these tenets from a Judeo-Pharisaic basis. Such explanation is given by a number of eminent scholars. The break with the temple sacrificial system is then accounted for by the refusal of these purists to have part in its contaminated ritual, or by their higher conception of the nature of real sacrifice, and their prayers in the morning are interpreted as not to the sun, but as simply coincident with his rising. Unquestionably much of their ritual system of purification can be explained as extreme Pharisaism; but that the whole of it can be so accounted for is doubtful. We must either reject Josephus' description of their sun-worship and anthropology, or seek the explanation of them in extra-Jewish sources. Buddhism, Parseeism, and Syrian heathenism have each been drawn upon for this explanation, but the striking similarity of Pythagorean ideals with those of Essenism and the long-continued presence of Greek influences in the land make this explanation of its origin plausible. Pythagoreanism shares with Essenism "its aspirations for bodily purity and sanctity, its lustrations, its simple habits of life apart from all sensual enjoyments, its high estimation of celibacy, its white garments, its repudiation of oaths, and especially its rejection of bloody sacrifices, also the invocation of the sun, and the scrupulosity with which all that was unclean was hidden from it, and lastly the dualistic view of soul and body" (Schürer). It was not Pythagoreanism as

a philosophical system, but Pythagoreanism as a help toward the attainment of a loftier purity, that made its teachings attractive to these earnest souls. Perhaps the renewal of friendship with the Lacedæmonians, in Jonathan's time, and the reference in that renewal to the bonds between them and the Jews (I. Mac. xii. 7, 10), which had been long-standing, may bear upon the question. Whatever the source of this stern ritual of purification, it made its observers respected. Their simple, orderly, devout life gave to the Jews some conception of the meaning of brotherhood within the limits of the nation itself. They exhibited none of the pride of the Pharisee nor the haughtiness of the Sadducee. They loved the humble, the feeble, and the poor and constantly ministered to their necessities.


115. The gradual steps by which the Pharisees and Sadducees attained the prominence in which we find them in the latter days of Hyrcanus are unknown to us. As we come, however, to understand the spirit of each, it is not difficult to mark in the national history events which would lead them out and on. The Maccabean leaders are not to be identified with either party. Their sympathies were naturally from the first with the Pharisees, but they also stood in close relations with the Sadducees. Hyrcanus had managed by a fair distribution of honors to avoid all open rupture, but the whole drift of his administration was away from the ideals of the Pharisees. According to the traditional account in Josephus (Ant. xiii. 10, 5, 6), a trivial incident brought affairs to a crisis. At a banquet given by the Pharisees, he took advantage of their genial mood to speak of his wish to serve their interests as fully as possible and to ask for the correc-

tion of any mistake in his conduct which they might have observed. To the general voice of commendation, which seems a bit insincere in view of the issues, a certain Eleazar made a startling exception by declaring that if Hyrcanus wished to be a really righteous man, he would give up his office of high-priest, assigning as the reason, that his mother had been a captive in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes,—a charge that implied her dishonor. Hyrcanus was very angry at this open insult. He was advised by a friend from the Sadducees to find out whether this was merely an individual attack or an expression of general Pharisaic opinion, by asking them to declare what punishment was due such an offence. They replied, "Stripes and bonds," and the mildness of the sentence was interpreted as a sort of approval of Eleazar's act. Thereupon Hyrcanus openly joined the Sadducees.

116. Two ways were possible to him for showing his opposition to the Pharisees. He could forbid the observance of all Pharisaic ordinances, as Josephus states he did (Ant. xiii. 10, 6), or he could remove the Pharisees from the highest positions of trust among the temple officials, from the supreme council, and from the courts of judgment. The latter was probably his course of action, for Hyrcanus came to no serious outbreak with the people, and a wholesale prohibition of the observance of Pharisaic enactments must certainly have precipitated a rebellion. The presence of Sadducees in the Senate would indirectly secure the setting aside of these ordinances and yet avoid a direct conflict. Strictly speaking, the contention of the Pharisees regarding the high-priesthood was justifiable, though the reason they gave for the illegitimacy of

Hyrchanus was utterly false. Indeed, the particulars of the story in Josephus reveal its legendary character, and the reason for the rupture must be found in the question about the priesthood. A deep distrust of such a union of royal and priestly power as Hyrcanus represented was really the underlying cause of dissension.

117. Fortunately for Hyrcanus himself, his days were not many after this unhappy break. He was spared the dread civil war which a few years later attested the bitterness of the antagonisms which first found open expression in his day. His long and generally prosperous reign ended peacefully, and he evoked from Josephus the following tribute of praise: "He administered the government in the best manner for thirty-one years. He was esteemed by God worthy of the three greatest privileges, the government of his nation, the dignity of the high-priesthood, and the power of prophecy, for God was with him and enabled him to know and to foretell the future. Thus, respecting his two eldest sons, he foretold that they would not long continue in the government of public affairs; and their unhappy fate will be worth description that people may thence learn how very much they came short of their father's happiness" (Ant. xiii. 10, 7).



X

THE REVIVAL OF HELLENISM AND THE STRUGGLE OF PARTIES

118. Two distinctly marked forces are now again at work within the life of the nation. Their interaction is the sum and substance of the history of the latter days of the Hasmoneans. They bring back under other names the ideals and the affinities of the days of Judas Maccabeus, and carry on in sad and direful fashion the old struggle between Hellenism and Judaism. The Maccabean state has attained its glory in supremacy over outside foes only to fall into ruin under the disintegrating action of internal rivalry. The question of the nation has resolved itself into this: shall a religio-political or a politico-religious force have the mastery? More and more the people themselves were being drawn into the settlement of this definite issue. The heroic service and devotion of their leaders hitherto had held them in loyal fidelity to that leadership. Now they were called upon to decide between their civil rulers and their religious teachers, and that decision involved them in civil war.

119. John Hyrcanus left the government to his wife and placed his eldest son, Aristobulus, in the high-priesthood. This appears as a peace measure, for it separated the civil from the religious leadership of

the nation; but it proved entirely futile, for Aristobulus, in order to have sole power, threw his mother into prison. Only Antigonus of the four brothers escaped imprisonment. He was given a place of honor because of the affection which his brother bore toward him. Aristobulus now proceeded to show his sympathies with the anti-Pharisaic tendencies in Jerusalem. He took the title of "king," peculiarly offensive to the Jews when assumed by one so clearly out of the Davidic line; he gave place to the customs and conceptions of Hellenistic culture; and he carried on a war of conquest which resulted in the addition of a large part of the Iturean territory to Judea (Ant. xiii. 11, 3). Schürer conjectures that this territory was mainly Galilee, and in this is seconded by Buhl (*Geographie des alten Pales.*). If true, then the actual Judaizing of Galilee was first accomplished at this time, and we have another instance of compulsory uniformity of faith through the rite of circumcision.

120. Aristobulus' extended dominion, however, gave him but brief satisfaction, for soon after his victory he was seized with a fatal illness. His dying hours were filled with remorse over the murder of his honored and beloved brother, Antigonus. Enemies of the latter had persuaded Aristobulus that he was intriguing to supplant him. At first the sick man would not believe the charge, but with suspicions aroused, he requested that his brother come to him unarmed. Should he appear in arms, he was to be killed. Antigonus was then informed that Aristobulus wished to see him in the glory of the new armor which he had just purchased, and, suspecting nothing, he went in full armor to the palace, where, in a secret passage-way, he was

murdered. Short as was the reign of this unhappy son of Hyrcanus, — one year in length, 105–104 B. C., — it was productive of great mischief in undoing much for which the Maccabees had suffered and struggled. The very sobriquet by which he was known, "Phil-Hellene," marks his reversal of the purposes of Judas and Jonathan and accounts for his favorable reputation among the Greeks, while the Pharisees could see in him little that was good.

121. Bad as he was in the eyes of the Pharisees, he did not compare in shamelessness and infamy with his successor, Alexander Jannæus, the third son of Hyrcanus. The promise of the man must have appeared early in the boy, for his father so disliked him that he sent him to Galilee, where he remained until Hyrcanus died. Aristobulus also feared the young man and kept him in prison. He was released only after the death of Aristobulus, then married the latter's widow and was given the kingship in 104 B. C. For twenty-six years he fought, intrigued, and murdered in the pursuit of his selfish ambitions and won for himself a place among the reprobates of Jewish history. When he came to power, all of western Palestine except a few cities was under the sway of the Hasmonæan sceptre. These cities, all of them Hellenistic in character and population, became at once the objects of his ambition for conquest. Ptolemais and Gaza had, during the recent rivalries of Grypos and Cyzicenus concerning the possession of Syria, declared themselves free republics.

122. Jannæus began his military operations by laying siege to them, he himself taking part in the attack upon Ptolemais. The undertaking soon involved him

in the most serious complications; for the men of Ptolemais, though they immediately repented of their action in appealing for aid to Ptolemy Lathurus, then in Cyprus, nevertheless thereby brought him with a large army into Syria. He was only too willing to gain a foothold upon land adjoining Egypt, whence he had been driven by his mother Cleopatra. The inhabitants of Gaza, together with Zoilus, who then ruled over Dora and Straton's Tower (afterward Cæsarea), came to Ptolemy for assistance; and in fear of the new force assembling against him, Jannæus withdrew into Judea. He now tried the double policy of bargaining with Ptolemy for his friendship and at the same time of inviting Cleopatra to march against her son. Ptolemy, on discovering this, turned with all his energy against the treacherous Jew. On the way to meet Jannæus, Ptolemy captured Asochus and stormed Sepphoris in Galilee, and finally fought a battle at a place now unknown, named Asphon, near the Jordan. The result was overwhelmingly disastrous for Jannæus. He lost a large army and placed his whole kingdom at the mercy of Ptolemy. The situation was desperate. Ptolemy hated the Jews because of their support of his mother in Egypt, and his march through some of the villages in Judea was characterized by shameful barbarities. Ptolemais fell into his hands, and Gaza opened her gates to him (Ant. xiii. 12, 2-6).

123. Only the timely interference of Cleopatra saved the Jews from the loss of everything for which they had so long struggled. With a large land and naval force she advanced against her son, who, taking advantage of her absence from Egypt, tried to make himself master there. In this he failed, and being driven out

of the country by an army sent for that purpose by Cleopatra, he returned to Gaza to find his mother in possession of the whole of Palestine. The Egyptian Jews had been faithful to the queen through all this trouble, and when her Jewish general Ananias advised her urgently not to listen to the councils of those who would make Judea a dependency of Egypt, she consented and made an alliance with Jannæus. Ptolemy was forced to go back to Cyprus, Cleopatra withdrew to her own dominions, and Jannæus was again established as an independent ruler (Ant. xiii. 13, 2).

124. It was to be expected that military expeditions which ended so disastrously would have mitigated Jannæus' lust of conquest. On the contrary, to its consuming desires was now added the passion for revenge, and once more he gathered mercenary troops for an expedition to the east of the Jordan and into Philistia. Gadara was taken after a siege of ten months, and then Amathus, a strong fortress near the Jordan. In this region he lost through carelessness, which gave the enemy an opportunity for a sudden attack, ten thousand men and all his camp equipment; but he was able, notwithstanding, to continue his march into the land of the Philistines, where he seized Raphia and Anthedon, and, after a year's siege, Gaza, whose gates were opened to him by treachery, and whose streets, as the result of the fury of revenge and despair, ran blood (Ant. xiii. 13, 3).

125. Nine years were spent in these expeditions, which fully absorbed the attention of Jannæus. He had little time for the consideration of internal affairs, and the development of party differences is, for this period, in a measure obscured. Certain recorded facts,

however, cast some light upon the progress of this inner antagonism. Alexandra, the wife of Jannæus, was an ardent supporter of the Pharisees, and Simon ben Shatach, her brother, a leader among them, was in honor at court because of his relationship to Alexandra. The Sadducees were undoubtedly in the majority in the supreme council after the disruption between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees, and Grätz conjectures that part of Simon's mission was to effect a change in the council and through royal influence to bring the Pharisees again into power. Whether or not this was actually accomplished, it is certain that Pharisaic influence was strengthened from within, while the whole policy of Jannæus was from without intensifying its antagonism against him. He was a warrior, not from necessity, as was Judas, but from choice, and his presence in the temple as high-priest was most offensive. When, therefore, he presumed to ignore as of very small importance one of the Pharisaic regulations regarding the ritual, and at the Feast of Tabernacles poured the water, the symbol of fruitfulness, not upon the altar, but on the ground at his feet, the long pent-up feelings of the worshippers broke forth. They hurled at him as an expression of their contempt the citrons which they had in their hands, reviled him as descended from a woman who had been a captive, and shouted that he was unworthy of the priesthood. To save himself from the angry mob and to punish them for their insolence, Jannæus called in his mercenaries, who slew six thousand men before the temple enclosure was cleared. He then built a wooden screen round the altar to secure himself against like attacks. His bloody deed crystallized

the enmity of the Pharisees. They waited only for an opportunity to make him feel its power (Ant. xiii. 13, 5).

126. That opportunity came soon. His love for war led him shortly after to make other incursions upon the tribes east of the Jordan. In one of these against an Arabian sheik, Obedas, he was lured into a rough and dangerous region and then attacked. His army was destroyed, and he barely escaped with his life. When he appeared in Jerusalem, the Pharisees aroused the people to rebellion, and for six weary years (94-89 B. C.), the land was desolated by civil war in which fifty thousand men lost their lives.

127. When Jannæus tried to stop the rebellion by offers of peace, the Pharisees would listen to no concession less than his own death. That being, of course, rejected, they appealed for help to Demetrius Eucærus, then governor of Damascus. The armies met at Shechem. The strength of the Sadducees is suggested by the fact that in the force of Jannæus were "twenty thousand of his party." After unsuccessful attempts to induce desertion from each side, — the Greeks from Jannæus and the Jews from Demetrius, — a battle ensued in which Jannæus was defeated. Once more, by the recklessness and incapacity of this man, the nation was brought to the brink of subjection. To be rid of him, the Pharisees would have undoubtedly accepted this issue, but the national interests prevailed. It were better to have a worthless high-priest over them who was a Jew, than to be at the mercy of a Syrian king. Six thousand of the Jews deserted to Jannæus, and Demetrius withdrew

from the country. The Pharisees were now exposed to the relentless hatred of Jannæus, and "his rage was grown so extravagant that his barbarity proceeded to the degree of impiety; for when he had ordered eight hundred to be hung upon crosses in the midst of the city, he had the throats of their wives and children cut before their eyes, and these executions he saw as he was drinking and lying down with his concubines. Upon which so deep a surprise seized on the people that eight thousand of his opposers fled away the very next night out of all Judea, whose flight was only terminated by Alexander's death" (J. W. i. 36, Ant. xiii. 14, 2). After this there was no more trouble from the Pharisees, but Jannæus obtained the contemptuous sobriquet "Son of a Thracian;" that is, a savage.

128. At this time there was serious trouble all around the borders of the Jewish kingdom. The empire of the Seleucidæ was in its death struggle, and the power of the Arabian king, Aretas, was assuming dangerous proportions. Rivals for the Syrian throne were either courting or resisting the influence of the Arab sheiks. These complications involved Jannæus in a brief war with Antiochus XII., who attempted to pass through Judea to Arabia. A wall and trench were carried across the country from Joppa to Caparsaba (later Antipatris), to prevent the passage of the Syrian army; but the barrier proved of no value. Antiochus burned the wall and marched on to his death in the battle with Aretas. The latter was then called to the governorship of Damascus, and soon after made an expedition into Judea and defeated Jannæus at Adida. By liberal concessions,

however, he was persuaded to withdraw to his own country.

129. Jannæus again was at liberty to indulge his passion for conquest, and he added successively to his dominions Pella, Dium, Gerasa, cities of the Decapolis, across the Jordan and eastward from Samaria; and north of these, Gaulana, Seleucia, and the fortress of Gamala. He was three years absent on these campaigns (84-81 B. C.), and his successes won for him a cordial reception upon his return to Jerusalem. The conquered cities were almost wholly Greek; and if Jannæus kept to his early policy, they were compelled to accept Judaism or be destroyed. At last the hardship of war and the excesses of his dissolute life began to tell upon him, and he was smitten with disease. Even then he could not refrain from war, and in 78 B. C., at the age of forty-nine, he died while besieging Ragaba, a fortress beyond the Jordan (Ant. xiii. 15, 5).

130. The weaker side of Phariseeism was revealed by the action of the party at his funeral, for it was owing to the unstinted praises which the Pharisees gave him that this much-hated man was buried with great pomp and splendor. He had, indeed, extended to their widest limits the boundaries of the Jewish kingdom; but its extent was its only remarkable feature. It was a conglomeration of diverse interests. Its unity was only superficial. Its glory was unsubstantial. In a few years a foreign power was to become its sole master. The influence of Hellenism had grown apace. The coins of Jannæus were inscribed in Greek as well as in Hebrew. Sadduceeism had been allowed a large share of power. Civil and mili-

tary interests overshadowed those of religion. One side of the mighty antithesis in the nation's life had received distinct and constant emphasis. The result was widened territory and external glory, but deep inner unrest and uncertainty.

XI

FATAL DISSENSIONS, AND THE COMING OF THE ROMANS

131. WHETHER, on his death-bed, Jannæus counselled his wife, Alexandra, to seek constantly the favor of the Pharisees (Ant. xiii. 15, 5), or to fear neither them nor their opponents, but to fear the hypocrites who pretend to be Pharisees (Talmud), it is certain that from the time of her accession until her death (78-69 B. C.), the Pharisees had control. As Josephus states, "while she governed other people, the Pharisees governed her" (J. W. i. 5, 2). The policy of the previous régime was, in every possible particular, reversed. All exiles were welcomed home, prison doors were opened, and the places of responsibility and honor were given to those who had so recently been cast out. Simon ben Shetach came back to gain and exercise an influence greater than he had ever known, and, if we may rely upon the traditions, he invited Judah ben Tabbaï from Egypt to come to Jerusalem and assist him in the great work of re-establishing, improving, and widening the power of the law. The high-priesthood had been given to the indolent and incompetent Hyrcanus, eldest son of Jannæus, while the younger son, Aristobulus, because of his shrewd, energetic, and ambitious nature had been studiously kept out of power. As long as the Pharisees did not meddle with

foreign affairs, they had their own way. Alexandra maintained a large body of mercenary troops and thereby inspired respect abroad. She had, however, little use for them, for with the exception of an ineffective expedition against Damascus, nothing of a war-like nature was undertaken during her reign.

132. Both the glory and the shame of the days of her reign are connected with the Pharisees themselves. Under the direction of Simon ben Shetach and Judah ben Tabbai, ceremonial observances which had been neglected were restored. Notable instances of these restorations were the ceremony of drawing water from the pool of Siloam during the Feast of Tabernacles and that connected with the wood-offering for the use of the altar. Both observances were honored with an impressive ritual. Special attention was given to the revision of the marriage laws, and to the laws of evidence, and for the first time provision was made for the education of young children. A new elementary school was placed in intimate connection with the synagogue. Hitherto it had been the duty of the father to instruct his son in the Torah. The requirement "that the children shall attend the elementary school" (Talmud Jer. Kethuboth viii. 11) marks a distinct step in the progress of the Jewish system of education, and reflects its light upon the Phariseism of the time. Another substantial and far-reaching ordinance established in this time was that imposing upon every Israelite of twenty years of age and over — proselytes and freedmen alike — a temple tax of a half-shekel. The Sadducees had maintained that the daily sacrifice should be supported by private benevolence. Support was now placed upon a firm, un-

failing basis. "As long as the voluntary system prevailed, it was suicidal to alienate those who alone were competent to contribute largely; but when a kind of poll-tax had been welcomed by the nation, every Sadducee could be excluded from the Sanhedrin with financial impunity and the whole ecclesiastical organization of Judaism was rendered independent of Sadducean grace or generosity" (Moss).

133. Had the desire to obliterate the work and influences of the Sadducees expressed itself only in religious reforms and ordinances, the Pharisees would have shown themselves worthy of the confidence Alexandra had reposed in them; but they could not restrain the spirit of revenge. They must have blood for those of their number whom Jannæus had slain. One after another, beginning with Diogenes, the Sadducean friend of Jannæus, was put to death, and a reign of terror began. Gathering about Aristobulus, who was glad to show himself their friend, the Sadducees sent a deputation to the palace, headed by Aristobulus himself, to plead their cause. In this they reminded the queen of their fidelity to Jannæus, asked her to give them honorable dismissal from her service, if she could not stop the Pharisees, and, after suggesting their worth to her enemies, if finally driven out, requested that they be allowed to retire to the fortresses in different parts of the land. Aristobulus spoke freely his own mind, and Alexandra granted their request, sending them to man and guard all her fortresses except three, — Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Machærus, "where her principal treasures were" (Ant. xiii. 16, 2, 3).

134. At this time a dark war cloud appeared on the

northern horizon. Tigranes, the king of Armenia, with an army of five hundred thousand men, threatened an invasion of Judea. Alexandra hastened to propitiate him with costly presents, but was relieved of her fears by the sudden return home of the king to meet the Romans, who were laying waste his kingdom (Ant. xiii. 16, 4).

135. The possession by the Sadducees of so many of the strongholds Aristobulus meant to use for his own purposes when the proper time came. The dangerous illness of his mother seemed the moment for action. He stole away secretly by night and persuaded the commanders to join him in his attempt to seize the kingdom. In less than fifteen days seventy-two fortresses and a multitude of people had given him their support. The Pharisees, in great alarm, imprisoned the wife and children of Aristobulus and sought to counsel with the queen, but she was too ill to think of matters of state and bade them do what they thought best.

136. Before there was an actual outbreak she died, in 69 B. C. Her short reign of nine years is spoken of in Pharisaic traditions as a golden age. To the Pharisees it was, indeed, a time of unhampered assertion. The Sanhedrin, which during Alexandra's reign was probably reorganized, gave them large opportunity for this assertion. To this august body she gave supreme authority in judicial and religious matters. It was also by her will that the doors of the Sanhedrin were first opened to the scribes, — an element destined to have an increasingly significant influence in the subsequent history of this supreme court of the nation. Nevertheless, these years were a time of preparation

for that little reaction which came immediately after Alexandra's death. The last independent ruler in Judea had passed away.

137. Hyrcanus II. came by right of succession to the kingship, but proved entirely incapable of holding it. Aristobulus defeated him in a battle near Jericho, and compelled him to give up to him both his royal and high-priestly rank. It is not difficult to imagine what changes this turn of affairs brought with it. Aristobulus was of the same mind as his father Jannæus. That insured the disappearance of the Pharisaic majority from the national councils and an emphasis upon political concerns such as had given its character to the long reign of Jannæus.

138. A significant name now confronts us in the pages of Jewish history, for it introduces us to a power which for one hundred years is to exert its manifold influences upon the life of Judea. Antipater, the grandfather of Herod the king, was appointed by Alexander Jannæus governor of Idumea. His son, also named Antipater, had, as it appears, succeeded him in the governorship. From his position as governor of Idumea, this second Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, had watched with keen interest the progress of matters in Jerusalem. It seemed easier to carry out his own ambitions with Hyrcanus at the helm than with Aristobulus. He therefore sought to persuade Hyrcanus, by all manner of falsehoods about Aristobulus, to reinstate himself upon the throne. He also appealed to the Jewish people in the interests of justice to join Hyrcanus in this attempt. As part of his plan, Antipater had secured the support of the Arabian king Aretas, who was to receive Hyrcanus

and reinstate him in his authority on condition that the territory and the twelve cities which Jannæus had taken from the Arabians should be returned. With an army of fifty thousand horse and foot, Aretas defeated Aristobulus. Deserters flocked to the standard of Hyrcanus, and Aristobulus took refuge upon the temple mount. It is not easy to say which side of the picture, that of the temple enclosure, or that of the besieging army, is the more forbidding. Aristobulus within the walls is matched by an impious throng outside, who did not hesitate to murder an old God-fearing man because he refused to utter imprecations upon Aristobulus, and who shamelessly broke their promises to the besieged by withholding from them certain animals for sacrifice at the Feast of the Passover, for which they had paid an extravagant price (*Ant.* xiv. 2, 1, 2).

139. Despite the strength of the walls protecting him, the fate of Aristobulus would soon have been sealed had not the success of the Roman army brought Pompey's lieutenants about this time within sound of the civil troubles in Judea. In 88 B. C. the Asiatic provinces under the leadership of Mithridates, king of Pontus, having revolted, Scylla was sent to bring them into subjection. Mithridates was compelled to beg for peace, but after a time renewed the war, which was maintained with varying fortune on each side till Pompey, in 66 B. C., conquered both Mithridates and Tigranes, king of Armenia. His success led him to the resolution to carry the sway of Rome to the banks of the Euphrates, and it was in the working out, in part, of this resolution that his generals were in Syria. While at Damascus, Scaurus heard of the siege in Jerusalem and hastened on to use the civil war in

some way for the advantage of Rome. He was met almost at the boundaries of Judea by ambassadors from both Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. Aristobulus won the day, since it was easier for the Roman army to dispose of the Arab hordes than to storm the fortified position of Aristobulus. Thus Aretas was compelled to raise the siege (Ant. xiv. 2, 3).

140. For a little time Aristobulus had undisputed possession. But Rome, with whom friendly treaties had been made, and who at a distance spoke such helpful words, now definitely determined to take a hand in the affairs of the nation. It was no longer a nation united against Syria that required help, but one divided against itself. In the judgment of the Romans a strong, steady government was needed to gain and secure the best results. Aristobulus soon felt the force of this, and lost no opportunity of strengthening the good-will of Pompey. In the spring of 63 B. C. Pompey himself came to Damascus, and three embassies appeared before him. Hyrcanus and Aristobulus maligned each other, but the messengers from the people expressed with unmistakable distinctness the desire for which the Pharisees had so long contended: "We do not wish to be under kingly government because the form of government we received from our forefathers was that of subjection to the priests of that God whom they worshipped" (Ant. xiv. 3, 2). In so far as the Romans took away the independence of Judea and stripped the high-priesthood of civil authority, these petitioners gained their wish, and "the first and most important stage of the battle between the Pharisees and the Sadducees came to an end" (Wellhausen).

141. Pompey promised to give a decision after he had made an expedition against the Nabateans; but Aristobulus, who had put on royal airs while in Damascus, was by no means satisfied and in mistrust prepared for resistance. Pompey turned at once from his proposed expedition and marched into Judea. He compelled Aristobulus to give up the fortresses which he held and drove him into Jerusalem where again the foolish man determined to make a stand. When Pompey appeared before the city, Aristobulus lost courage, went to the Roman leader, and promised, in addition to a plentiful supply of money, to open to him the gates of the city. Gabinius and his soldiers were sent to receive the money and take possession of the city, but found the gates closed; and Pompey, in anger at the supposed treachery of Aristobulus, threw him into prison and prepared to take the city by force (Ant. xiv. 3, 3, 4).

142. A division of opinion within the city itself enabled Pompey to get possession of all but the temple mount without drawing a sword. The followers of Hyrcanus looked upon the Roman leader as their ally, and quietly let him in. The adherents of Aristobulus, who had urged resistance, as soon as they were outvoted, seized upon the temple mount, cut off the bridge which reached from it to the city, and prepared for a siege. Pompey found himself confronted with a serious task. The only possible point of attack was on the north, and along this side the fortifications were very strong. For three months the Romans made strenuous efforts to open a way into the enclosure. They might have toiled much longer had they not learned to take advantage of the unwillingness of the

Jews to fight on the Sabbath. On that holy day in the month of June, 63 B. C., a breach was made in the walls, and troops were hurried into the enclosure. The priests were ministering at the altar as though no danger were near. Many of them fell in the frightful massacre by which on that day twelve thousand Jews lost their lives. Pompey and his officers, out of curiosity, committed the unpardonable sacrilege of entering the Holy of Holies, and were astonished to find it entirely empty, but they wisely left the treasures of the temple untouched and commanded the ministers about the temple to cleanse the enclosure and carry on the services. The leaders of the war were beheaded, and Aristobulus and his children reserved to grace Pompey's triumph in Rome.

143. Now came the judgments which, one after another, made utterly void the great results of years of toil and struggle. (1) Judea was made tributary to Rome. Independence was forever lost. (2) Her territorial gains along the coast, over the Jordan and in Samaria, were all taken from her and placed under the oversight of the governor of the Roman province of Syria. While the cities in these regions rejoiced in their freedom from Judea, she became again a small and comparatively insignificant province. (3) The title of "ethnarch" was substituted for that of king. Such was the outcome of the internal strife which for thirty years had been weakening the nation.

144. When Pompey reinstated Hyrcanus in the high-priesthood, the Pharisees were in a sense satisfied. Even though the walls of Jerusalem were thrown down and the national honor was brought low, they could interpret it all as a victory. Judaism had gained the

day. Yet they had no love for heathen rulership. Pompey had won their lasting hatred by his unpardonable profanation of the temple, and they were accustomed to trace his falling fortunes to that presumptuous act. It was the overthrow of the Hasmoneans with their worldly policy and ambitions that seemed to them a just judgment of God. As a nation they had been punished, but that punishment was for correction. They had only one king to look for and that was the Messiah, whose glorious reign would give them supremacy and peace, with all attendant blessings.

145. In the so-called Psalms of Solomon, which were written in the interval between 63 and 48 B. c., are found the conceptions and hopes of the earnest, loyal Pharisees of the days immediately following the fall of Judea under the Roman power. Through them all runs the thought of the righteousness of God, of the divine chastisement of sinners, and of the sure mercy of him whose promise makes certain the blessings of Israel in the kingdom of the Messiah. They themselves make no claim to be the words of Solomon, and their conception of the righteousness which should be the goal of man's whole effort, and which is to be the characteristic of the Messiah, is purely Pharisaic. By this standard the author measures the usurpers of David's throne and declares the justice of their fall.

Thou, O Lord, didst choose David as Israel's king
 And to his seed didst swear that evermore
 His kingdom should abide before thee.
 But in our folly sinners rose against us,
 Set themselves over us and abused us;
 Those to whom thou gavest no promise by force have
 claimed it;

They have not held in honor thy name, august in majesty ;
But in their arrogance have placed upon themselves the
crown.

But, thou, O Lord, hast cast them down
And taken their seed from the earth,
In that thou hast brought against them
A stranger to our race :

In accordance with their sins wilt thou recompense them
(xvii. 5-11).

The saddening estimate of the corruption of the people (xvii. 22 ; ii.), is based upon their departure from "righteousness ;" that is, the observance of the law. Undoubtedly among these "sinners" stand out prominently before the mind of the Psalmist the Sadducean Hellenizing party whose wealth and station made them lax in more ways than one. The only hope for all is in repentance under the afflicting mercy of God. These psalms will always be of interest to the theologian because of their earnest presentation of the doctrines of the Messiah and of the resurrection and immortality of the righteous. Amid the humiliation and trials of those days when Pompey polluted the temple and independence was taken away, the hope of the Messiah burned with a new and intense brightness. It seemed the veritable "foretime" to his coming. Hence the prayer : —

Look upon Israel and bring to her her king,
The son of David in the time which thou hast chosen out,
O God !

That thy servant may rule over thy people,
Gird him with strength ;
That he may crush unrighteous princes,

That he may purify Jerusalem from the heathen,
That he may cast out the sinner from his inheritance
And break his pride as an earthen vessel,
That with an iron sceptre he may break up all their substance,
And destroy godless people by his mouth !

He will gather together the holy people
Whom he will lead in righteousness.

To him belong the nations of the heathen ;
Who shall serve under his yoke.
By the subjugation of the whole earth
Shall he give glory to the Lord.

From the ends of the earth shall the peoples come
To see the glory of his presence.

He is a righteous king
By God with wisdom blessed to govern his people.

His hope is placed in neither rider, horse, nor bow,
Nor does he gather gold for purposes of war.

Pure he is from sin
That he may have extended rule,
And destroy all princes who sin,
By his mighty word.

God hath made him strong in his Holy Spirit
And wise in helpful counsel,
Full of power and righteousness.

He shall feed the flock of the Lord ;
He shall not leave any among them
To be weak in their pasture ;

In holiness he shall lead them
And there shall not be among them
Any one arrogant to exercise authority.

He shall judge in the synagogues the peoples,
The tribe of the sanctified;
His words shall be as words of the saints
In the midst of the sanctified people (xvii. 23-49).

This noble picture, constructed in part out of contrasts to the conditions about him, and in part out of longings for that nobler, better time when righteousness should "have free course and be glorified," exemplifies clearly the character of the Messianic hope as it took form among the faithful spirits of Judaism. The Messiah is a human king and ruler whom God will endow with special gifts and powers, fulfilling the highest ideals of both religion and government.


146. Hardly less notable than the teaching regarding the Messiah is that concerning the resurrection and immortality of the righteous.

They who fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal;
Their life shall be in the light of the Lord
And never shall he fail (iii. 16).

The saints of the Lord with him shall live forever;
The paradise of God,
The trees of life his saints are (xiv. 2).


The life of the just is forever (xiii. 9).

With such hopes hearts were stayed in these days of
deep unrest.



PART II

THE ROMAN PERIOD OF JEWISH
HISTORY



I

THE HISTORICAL SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD

147. WITH the victory of Pompey over Jerusalem in 63 B. C., the Roman period of Jewish history began; its close may be and has been variously marked. If the period be made to include all the years in which the Roman emperors directed affairs in Palestine, and subjected the Jews to the imperial will, its limit is not reached even with the end of the second century of our era. If the limit be sought in an event which seriously affected the Jews in Palestine, there is still opportunity for difference of opinion, since the war of 70 A. D. and the more terrible rebellion against Hadrian in 135 A. D. were both critical and fateful. It was in the year 70 A. D., however, that the great rallying centre of the nation, the temple, was destroyed, and its demolition followed by a gradual withdrawal of the priesthood from public life. At the same time the Sanhedrin disappeared, and with it the Sadducean party. The nation as a nation then lost its highest religious and political privileges. Henceforth it was to have no vestige of political oneness, even under foreign domination. Its unifying power was the law alone. Hopes for the future revived, but the Jewish nation was from the year 70 A. D. a thing of the past. There is sufficient reason,

therefore, for taking this date as a proper limit. For over one hundred and thirty years Judea was brought into direct touch with the Roman power, and, despite the relatively large liberty given to her, worked out slowly but surely her own ruin. The period is of the deepest interest, not only by reason of the changes which took place in the Roman world itself, and in consequence also in Palestine, but also because in this period Jesus lived and accomplished his mission and Christianity was established.

148. The sources of our knowledge of this important period are the Jewish historians, the New Testament, the literature of the rabbis, and the writings of Greek and Latin historians and biographers. Recent valuable work in archæology and geography contributes also its share toward a clear understanding of times which must always have their significance in their relation to the true, but despised Messiah.

149. With the same general purpose and from the same point of view, Josephus, in his "Antiquities," continues his history from the Maccabean period to the outbreak of the war with Rome in 66 A. D. He is still apologetic in tone and desirous of commending his people and himself to the Romans. The coloring which this desire gives to his views must always be carefully noted. The history varies in fulness and detail with different parts of the period. The reason is apparently in the character of the sources upon which he depended. Strabo and Nicolas of Damascus supply him with most of his material for the earlier part of the period; the latter is his greatest reliance for the time of Herod the king. For the time between Herod's death, 4 B. C., and the reign of Agrippa I.,

41-44 A. D., Josephus gives only meagre information; and then his account again becomes more detailed. In the Jewish War the narrative, as it enters upon the particulars of the war itself, has all the fulness and vividness of an eye-witness. In comparison with the books of the Jewish War (iii.; vii.), the later books of the Antiquities show less care in preparation. His persistent endeavor to make it apparent that his people were actually friends of the Romans, and in reality took up arms against them unwillingly, is a notable example of his coloring of the situation, and compels the acceptance of his assertions with some caution. The Antiquities were not completed until 93 or 94 A. D. (Ant. xx. 11, 3); the Jewish War, at some time between 69-79 A. D. (Against Ap. i. 9).

150. Our New Testament has a twofold value in its witness to the movement of events during the time covered by its record. It opens to us the institution and development of Christianity, and it makes clear to us the spirit and trend of the forces in the world all about the new and triumphing cause of the crucified and risen Messiah. It is true that a knowledge of the times of Jesus and the apostles is needful to an understanding of the attitude and progress of both himself and his apostles. Conversely, their spirit and attitude interpret for us with unmistakable clearness the misconceptions of Judaism and the disastrous blindness of heathenism. The simple, graphic pictures of the gospels are true to fact in geography, customs, life, and national hope. They show us the scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Romans, and the people in all their characteristic features. In the dramatic story of the Book of the Acts, and in the epistles, we enter

with the apostles the various centres of Græco-Roman life all about the Mediterranean. Jesus himself "swept across the hopelessly darkened sky of Israel like a meteor flashing and vanishing; he had no effect upon the history of the Jewish people, and the fact that he did not do this, that he deliberately refused to do so, became, humanly speaking, his doom." The "flashing," however, revealed the woful mistakes of Judaism, the hopelessness of her most fascinating hopes, and the certainty of her failure. In the pages of the New Testament the central interest of Judaism is brought to test. The law is estimated and adjudged. Religious parties, temple ritual, and national interests are all allowed to speak with the accent peculiar to their time. Meanwhile a voice is heard, in whose prophetic ring, reality and truth, eternal truth, are manifest. From the days of John the Baptist at the Jordan to the dark hour of the crucifixion, there is no confusion in these voices. Judaism is true to herself; Jesus to himself. The antithesis all the way through, from the murmuring at the cleansing of the temple to the derisive shouts about the cross, is itself a revelation of the spirit that lived and moved in court and palace, school and workshop, field and camp. Nor does the antithesis cease with the pages of the gospel. The Judaism of the dispersion carries it forward on one side; James, Peter, Paul and John, on the other.

151. If the New Testament in its simple, vivid narratives thus makes possible a clear insight into the character and insufficiency of Judaism, quite another view of it is gained from the pages of rabbinical literature. Judaism here speaks in the language of her most approved teachers; here is the essence of her

spirit. Under the phrase "rabbinical literature" are included the Mishna, the Talmuds, the Midrashim, and the Targums. All of these date from times considerably later than the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, but as they gather up the teachings of the rabbis, handed down from generation to generation, they contribute a share toward the understanding of the Roman period of Judaism.

152. The Mishna, the oldest codification of the Jewish traditional law in our possession, dates from the close of the second century A. D., and its composition is ascribed to Judah the Holy. Its contents are almost purely of that kind of comment known as Halacha, or "binding rule," and its sixty sections or tractates set forth a wide variety of requirements. The Talmuds, of which there are two, the Palestinian and the Babylonian, date respectively from the fourth and sixth centuries of our era. They contain the Mishna with the commentary, which was in turn constructed for its interpretation. This commentary is sometimes called the Gemara. The traditional interpretation of the law itself is the Mishna; the traditional interpretation of the Mishna is the Gemara. The Talmuds are the Mishna and Gemara combined. Both Talmuds are written in Aramaic; neither covers in its comment the entire contents of the Mishna. In all of these the halachic method of explanation prevails, although the haggadic, — that is, the more entertaining and edifying method of discourse, — is not wanting. In the Midrashim, which form still another class of rabbinical literary products, both styles of comment are found, and the interpretation is directly of the scripture text. The Targums, whose collec-

commentary upon scripture text!

tion in written form is also of late origin, owed their existence in oral form to the necessity of a translation for the people of the synagogal lessons from Hebrew into Aramaic. These translations varied in character from a strictly literal rendering to a free paraphrase, interpretative in nature. Lest these renderings should be considered of equal authority with the original, it was forbidden in earlier times to commit them to writing. Tradition relates that when Jonathan brought out his Targum on the prophets, the displeasure of Heaven was revealed in a voice which asked, "Who is this that hath revealed my secrets to men?" The Targum ascribed to Onkelos is a literal translation of the Pentateuch, while that of Jonathan is a free, interpretative paraphrase of the historical and prophetic books.

153. The value of all these purely Jewish works is greatest for the study of the spirit and faith of Judaism. They present to the student of the times a mass of translations and expositions in which fable, legend, anecdotes, quaint sayings, and fantastic notions abound. What evidence comes from them for definite historical situations needs careful examination. Fortunately for all who wish to make this "thesaurus of views from various centuries" serviceable, such works as Derenbourg's "*Histoire de la Palestine*," Weber's "*Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmuds*," and Wünsche's "*Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*" offer a selected and systematic arrangement of the materials. Thus arranged, these materials constitute a valuable source for the study of the inner spirit of the great religious parties, of the Jewish theology, and of those methods of hand-

ling the Old Testament Scriptures by which not only "a hedge was placed about the law," but also a seconding was found for all that teaching which committed Judaism to the sad way of its own humiliation.

154. The real secret of that humiliation, as far as human history is concerned, was in the determined unwillingness of Judaism to accept the domination of Rome. The nation's death was due to a persistent, growing antagonism to its political environment. Hence we can fully understand the situation only as we study the relations of Rome to Judea as well from the Roman as from the Judean side. The character and policy of the emperors, the political necessities of the empire, and the means by which the unification of the Roman world was to be realized, — these have an important bearing upon the history of the Jews. For light upon such themes we turn to the biographies of Plutarch, notably those of Crassus, Pompey, Caesar, Brutus, and Antony; to the *Lives of the XII. Emperors*, by Suetonius; to the histories of Appian (bk. xi.) and of Dio Cassius (xxxvii.-liv.); also to the *History and Annals of Tacitus*. These authors, it will be understood, deal only incidentally with the special history of the Jews. Their interest centres in the course and policy of the emperors or in the province of Syria, but the points of contact are easily discerned, and the relation of the whole to the part which Judea plays makes only more apparent the peculiar and perplexing problems which the Jews forced upon the Romans. Tacitus gives in book v. 1-13, of his history a mere sketch of the history of the Jews to the time of the war with Titus. The generally contemptuous estimate which the Romans

had of the Jews as a people is reflected in both Horace and Juvenal. Rome had no conception of the import of that religious development, which in its way was to be as much a preparation for Christianity as was the unification of the world under the power of the emperor.

155. A study of the mental interests of the nation in this critical period brings to light two well-marked lines of development. One is devoted to the unfolding of the inner meanings of Judaism itself, — its observances, institutions, and hopes; the other to the bearings and issues of the presence of the Romans in the Holy Land. The traditions of the rabbis illustrate one; various apocryphal books the other.

156. Noteworthy among the latter is the collection entitled the Psalms of Solomon. There are eighteen of these Psalms, and in them is found the outburst of an earnest, overburdened spirit, which sees in the coming of Pompey an evidence of the righteous judgment of God (ii., viii.). The sins of Israel are just cause for lamentation, but the presumption of the heathen invader shall not escape God's wrath; nor shall those in Israel whose sympathies have been turned away from the law (ii., xvii.). But not all Israel shall be destroyed — chastisement will reveal a chosen people, the veritable children of God (ix., xiv.); over them God shall reign as king forever (v., xvii.). For them is reserved the glory of the Messianic times (xvii., xviii.). The numerous historical allusions in the various Psalms (i., ii., viii., xvii.) fit to the times succeeding the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey. He is the one "whose heart is a stranger to our God" (xvii. 15), and the Sadducees are they who are re-

sponsible for the pitiable fate of Jerusalem. The voice in these Psalms is clearly that of a Pharisee who, while he will give no superficial interpretation of the dark outcome of the nation's internal strifes, will also emphasize God's mercy, and upon that base his clear, strong hope for the blessed days of the Messiah. These Psalms are witness to the fact that Israel, in these later days, could yet pour out her soul in the exalted strain of the poets of earlier times.

157. Still another voice from Pharisaic Judaism speaks to us in the Assumption of Moses, but now with a different tone and with quite another purpose. By its teachings and prophecies we are brought forward to that time after the death of Archelaus, when the restlessness under Roman domination becomes impatient of the slow and sober preparation for the Messiah's coming involved in keeping the law and in repentance. More forcible measures are growing increasingly attractive, and the zealots are leavening the nation with their eager, irrepressible spirit. The book is an earnest protest against this spirit. The author, patriotic as he is, deprecates all appeal to arms (ix. 2-6). He refuses to follow those Pharisees who are turning from their old position of non-resistance to active participation in politico-religious movements. His faith is fixed upon the all-decisive intervention of God (x. 3-10), who asks no help from an arm of flesh, but only obedience to his law. The book, which naturally divides itself into two parts, — one historical (chaps. i.-v. and viii.-ix.), and the other prophetic (vii., x.), — is in reality "the Testament" rather than "the assumption" of Moses. These were "originally independent works, which subsequently were

• missing of more ancient

Corah was the Law

put together and edited in one" (Charles). Noteworthy in this product of conservative Phariseeism are its teachings regarding the future of Israel. The Messianic Kingdom will be ushered in by a day of repentance (i. 17), but God himself will punish the Gentiles (x. 7). The silence about any Messiah may be because of the growing martial spirit in the nation. As the Psalms of Solomon voice the nation's desires and herald the day which with each succeeding decade became the object of greater longing and the reason for a more fiery zeal, so on the other side this Testament of Moses speaks its sober word against a mistaken ambition and seeks to call the nation back to its more spiritual ideals. Its mission failed. The nation was too far down the swift current of events to turn back, even if it could hear the warning voice.

158. The Book of Jubilees also, in all probability, from the Pharisees, belongs, with the traditions of the rabbis, in the first line of development to which reference has been made. The work is virtually a commentary on Genesis and the first chapters of Exodus, after the fashion of the Haggadah. It has a double title, — "Little Genesis," that is, a Genesis of less authority than the canonical book, or "The Jubilees," that is, the book whose chronological basis is the jubilee period of forty-nine years. The point of view of the author is revealed by his repeated endeavors to maintain the exalted, eternal character of the law. In this the spirit of legalism is clearly expressing itself. As illustrating the haggadic character of its comment are the stories and fables about the patriarchs, and the attempts to carry one back of the accounts in Genesis by explanations which are

purely fanciful, as, for example, that the serpent speaking in Paradise did only what all animals could do before the fall (iii. 24). The exact date of the Book of Jubilees is uncertain. Its chief value to the student of later Judaism is in its method and spirit. These bear witness to the character of that kind of teaching which both Jesus and his apostles had earnestly and resolutely to set aside.

159. The later works, The Apocalypse of Baruch, The Fourth Book of Ezra, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, contribute in like manner to an understanding of the methods, beliefs, and hopes of the Judaism which existed, not only before the destruction of Jerusalem, but which also survived it.

II

THE TROUBLOUS TIMES OF HYRCANUS II

160. WHILE the nation was mourning the loss of its independence and honor, Rome was exulting in the successes of her great general, in whose triumphal procession marched the captives of nearly all known peoples. Aristobulus, the Jewish king, walked in front of the royal chariot, and in the train which followed were many of his countrymen. Saved, with all the other captives, from execution by the humanity of Pompey, they found a dwelling-place in a district of the city on the right bank of the Tiber and formed the Roman Jewish community, which in its descendants was destined to exert a mighty influence upon the affairs both of Rome and all succeeding nations. The Pharisees looked with undisguised satisfaction upon the great change which had taken place in the national situation. The masses of the people, however, were not so ready to accept the new order as were their spiritual teachers. The national spirit lived on among them, and they were ready to seize any promising opportunity to get back their independence. They were taught with increasing emphasis that the Messiah would correct all their misfortunes, and thus were instructed to find their daily satisfactions in the earnest duties of religion, and in the quiet occupations of the field or of trade; but when, at times,

appeal was made to them to strike for freedom, they responded with surprising alacrity.

161. Pompey's conquests, looked at apart from Judea's humiliation, must, on the whole, be estimated as a blessing. The blessing certainly was in disguise as far as Judea was concerned, but the rivalries of petty kingdoms, the heterogeneity of the Jewish kingdom itself and the thorough-going dissensions within it, gave small hope of strong, progressive independence. A firm hand now held in check all over-ambitious princes, and made possible to both cities and provinces the development of their own resources. Upon his first organization of the entire Syrian province, Pompey was content to constitute it in part out of a large number of free cities with their adjacent districts, and in part out of petty principedoms dependent directly upon Rome. The victories of the different Hasmonean leaders had brought many of these free cities into subjection, and their liberation from Jewish control was to them a distinct gain. In this system of free cities the Romans saw the means of promoting Hellenism in the East. They, therefore, accorded them generous treatment. They were recognized as the pillars of civilization, granted exceptional privileges in the way of self-government, and seconded in all their commercial and literary ambitions. Where, from the calamities of war, only the ruins of such Hellenic centres remained, restoration at once began. So Samaria, Scythopolis, Dora, Azotus, Anthedon, Marissa, Gaza, and Raphia were soon rebuilt, as well as Gadara, Pella, and Dium. The organization of the Decapolis by Pompey is an instance of his treatment of Hellenic cities. Opportunities

for commerce and for all human intercourse were greatly enlarged.

162. In accord with these varying estimates of Pompey's mastery in Palestine are the different trends which manifest themselves in the life within its borders. Satisfied in the possession of truth, and with their hopes of a brilliant future, the Pharisees turned away from national affairs to the elaboration of the law. They gave themselves up to the work of rounding out and perfecting their religious ideals, a work which, as we shall see, had both a bright and a dark side. The people, dissatisfied with their political vassalage, made trouble for their new rulers, and repeatedly won for themselves the reputation of being exceptionally fractious. The Hellenistic centres all about the now-restricted province of Judea entered with rejoicing upon the development of their strength and influence. The history of the Roman period is the history of the interaction and outworking of these various forces, under the mastery of the great western power. Deep as is its interest when viewed as the last period of the nation's existence, it is all made more significant by the fact that in the midst of it Jesus lived and Christianity was born.

163. For a few years after Pompey's departure peace reigned in Palestine. The Roman general, Scaurus, did undertake an expedition against Aretas; but the whole episode has interest more from the prominence of Antipater in it than from the result which was a treaty of peace with the Nabathean king. The crafty Idumean who had been appointed the prime-minister of Hyrcanus was virtually the man of the hour in Judea. The first manifestation of the national

spirit was in the year 57 B. C., when Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, having escaped from the guards while on the way to Rome as a captive, appeared in Judea and urged his countrymen to put him upon the throne. They responded with an army of ten thousand foot and fifteen hundred horse. Hyrcanus was powerless, and only the timely arrival of Gabinius, the proconsul of Syria, defeated the purposes of Alexander. In an engagement at Jerusalem the Jews lost heavily, and Alexander took refuge in the fortress of Alexandrium. This he was finally compelled to give up with the other Maccabean strongholds, Hyrcanium and Machærus, which he had fortified. The first attempt to gain independence failed (Ant. xiv. 5, 2-4; J. W. i. 8, 2-5).


164. Gabinius determined at once to arrange affairs so that a second attempt would have even less hope of success. He razed to the ground all three of the surrendered fortresses; took from Hyrcanus all political administration, leaving him simply the care of the temple, and then introduced a change in the form of the government which should break up, if possible, the spirit of national unity. This was a division of the country into five districts, each of which was to be ruled by its own council. This council was, in each case, composed of leading citizens and was directly responsible to the proconsul. Jerusalem, Gazara, Amathus, Jericho, and Sepphoris were selected as the seats of these new councils. Another measure for begetting divisive interests was the rebuilding of old Hellenistic centres of influence, many of which the Jews had destroyed. Their restoration gave large room for a non-Jewish population. With apparent

satisfaction Josephus mentions the fact that "the Jews were now freed from kingly rule and were governed by an aristocracy" (Ant. xiv. 5, 4).

2 165. Hardly had Gabinius completed his changes in government when Aristobulus himself, who, with his son Antigonus, had escaped from Rome, involved the country in another revolution. Many of the Jews flocked to his standard, but they were no match for the disciplined forces of the Romans. After a disastrous battle, Aristobulus fled across the Jordan and intrenched himself on the site of the fortress of Machærus. Here he was captured and sent again as a prisoner to Rome. His children, however, were given their freedom at the request of Gabinius and returned to Judea.

3 166. While Gabinius was away upon an expedition to Egypt, Alexander thought it a good time to try again to secure the sovereignty. Once more the Jews gathered about him, and before the Roman army reached Palestine again the rebellion had gained considerable headway. Alexander had an army of thirty thousand and was eager for battle. Antipater, who had been helping Gabinius with the Egyptian expedition, was sent to persuade the Jews of the folly of their undertaking; but Alexander would listen to nothing but war, and, in the battle near Mount Tabor which soon followed, was hopelessly defeated (Ant. xiv. 6, 2-3). The result of this reckless effort of Alexander was to give Antipater a surer grasp upon the direction of affairs, for all matters in Jerusalem were arranged according to his wishes. Hyrcanus was becoming more and more the mere tool of his shrewd prime minister.

167. Meanwhile a change of wide-reaching significance had been brought about in Rome itself. Julius Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus, distinguished respectively for mental power, military successes, and astonishing wealth, had formed a triumvirate with the express purpose of breaking the power of the Roman Senate and aristocracy, and directing the government according to their wishes. As the outcome of this scheme, Pompey, with the rank of consul, became, in 55 B. C., the administrator of the affairs of Spain, and Crassus, with the same rank, of Syria. Crassus was particularly anxious for military glory, and an expedition against the Parthians seemed the best way to secure it. The Jews now became acquainted with another sort of Roman. Pompey and Gabinius had indeed outraged the religious sense of the people, but they had scrupulously kept their hands off the temple treasures. Eleazar, the guardian of these treasures, fearing Crassus, tried to save them by a costly present to him, and Crassus promised, upon the receipt of it, to touch nothing else. In shameless violation of his word, he carried away everything of value that he could find. Fortunately Judea was relieved from any further rapacity, for the ambitious consul lost most of his army and his life in Parthia. Cassius, his lieutenant, led back the remnant of the army into Syria, and soon found out that he had serious work before him in not only keeping the Parthians out of Syria, but also in putting down another revolt of the Jews which resulted from the robbery committed by Crassus. The decisive encounter with the Jews took place at Taricheæ, on the Lake of Galilee, in 52 B. C. The Jews were defeated, their leader, Pitholaus, put to



notice

death at the instigation of Antipater, and thirty thousand of them sold into slavery. Thus within five years four insurrections expressed the restless spirit of the people under the Roman rule. In part this restlessness was due to the effrontery of the Romans themselves; in part it was the outcome of that patriotism which was easily enkindled by some inspiring word from one of the old and honored Hasmonean house.

168. In the year 49 B. C. began that critical period in the history of Rome, — the period of the civil wars. The death of Pompey's wife, Julia, the daughter of Julius Cæsar, severed the last tie which held these two great leaders together and the struggle for supremacy commenced. Plutarch gives us the interesting picture of Cæsar, at the banks of the Rubicon, weighing the issues of his critical position and hesitating to bring upon the world the calamities which his crossing would involve. "At last, upon some sudden impulse, bidding adieu to his reasonings and plunging into the abyss of futurity, in the words of those who embark in doubtful and arduous enterprises, he cried out, 'The die is cast!' and immediately passed the river." Soon after he was master of all Italy, while Pompey and the aristocratic party of the Senate were "beyond the Ionian Sea." It has been said that from Cæsar's crossing the Rubicon down to the death of Antony, 49-30 B. C., the whole history of Rome was reflected in the history of Syria and also in that of Palestine, every change and turn in the Roman history being answered by a corresponding movement in Syrian history (Schürer).

169. Hyrcanus and Antipater had been careful to

keep in favor with the subordinates of Pompey. From the changed conditions in Rome were now to be expected only overthrow and death, if Cæsar's first move was to be an index of his whole line of action, for he released Aristobulus and gave him two legions with which to set matters right in his own hand. Had not the adherents of Pompey poisoned the hapless king and at the same time beheaded his son Alexander, who could have taken up his father's cause, the days of Hyrcanus might have been short.

170. On the 9th of August, 48 B. C., the armies of the great rivals came together on the plains of Pharsalia and Pompey was defeated. From the battlefield he fled to Egypt, where he was basely murdered just as he was about to step on shore. Antipater's conduct was now strictly in accord with the genius of his house. He changed sides. This easy method of getting on would have availed him but little had not his keen watchfulness found opportunities to make him really serviceable to his friends. Such opportunities now opened up to him in this way: Cæsar followed Pompey to Egypt with a small force, and, instead of sailing away, as it was expected he would do on learning of the death of Pompey, he attempted a settlement of the trouble existing between Cleopatra and her brother. These two, by the will of their father, Ptolemy Auletes, had been made joint rulers in Egypt, but the young king had been persuaded by his advisers to depose his sister. In Syria, whither she went as an exile, she raised an army and returned by the way of Pelusium, determined to reclaim her share of the throne. Cæsar, being fascinated by the queen from the moment he first saw her,

at once espoused her cause. After many vicissitudes Cæsar found himself with his small force in close quarters in Alexandria, since not only the city was against him, but also the Roman troops stationed in Egypt. He therefore sent to Mithridates of Pergamum for assistance, and while waiting for his arrival was involved in several serious engagements. At length Mithridates appeared, and Cæsar effected a junction with him at Memphis, where the Egyptian forces were defeated and Alexandria thus put completely at his mercy. Cæsar generously forgave the city, arranged governmental affairs to the satisfaction of Cleopatra, and left a strong Roman garrison to maintain order.

171. If the account of Josephus may be trusted, Antipater, on four different occasions, proved the sincerity and value of his new allegiance. First he brought to Mithridates, while he was hesitating at Ascalon, a large reinforcement of Arabians, Syrians, and Jews, and thus enabled the king to continue his march to Pelusium. Then at Pelusium he distinguished himself by making the first breach in the wall and thus securing the capture of the city. Arriving in Egypt, he influenced the Jews to espouse the cause of Cæsar; and, lastly, by his skill and bravery, he turned the tide of battle near Memphis and made it possible for Cæsar to join the allies and thus to rout the Egyptians (Ant. xiv. 8, 1, 2).

172. Such distinguished service could not fail of high reward. Upon his visit shortly after to Syria, Cæsar gave to Antipater the privilege of Roman citizenship and freedom from all tribute, and also confirmed him in his position of prime minister to

Hyrcanus. According to Josephus (Ant. xiv. 8, 3), Hyrcanus accompanied Antipater into Egypt, and Cæsar's letter to the Sidonians (Ant. xiv. 10, 2) gives the credit of the Egyptian successes to the high-priest. This acknowledgment can be true only indirectly, nevertheless, Hyrcanus received a worthy share of the reward. Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, appeared before Cæsar and pressed his claims to recognition, but by a clever speech Antipater refuted all his pretensions, and he was ignominiously dismissed. Political authority was given back to Hyrcanus, and his position as ethnarch and high-priest was declared hereditary. The division of the land into districts, as arranged by Gabinius, was abolished. Jerusalem was made the centre of jurisdiction for the land, and in all Jewish matters the Jews themselves were given arbitration. Not only did they thus gain judicial freedom, but religious liberty also was assured them both at home and throughout the East. In Palestine they were exempted from military service in the legions and relieved from supporting the Roman garrisons. They were excused from the tribute placed upon them by Pompey. They were allowed to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem and Joppa; Lydda and other places which Pompey had taken from them were restored. It was with good reason that the Jews, above all other foreign peoples, mourned a few years later the death of Cæsar. Their lamentation was heard not only in Judea, but in Egypt, where he had confirmed all the much-prized privileges of the nation; in Asia Minor, where he had guaranteed them full religious freedom, and in Rome itself, where his memory was held by them in high honor (Ant. xiv. 10, 1, 8, 20-24).

173. There was, however, one serious offset to all these gracious concessions. Antipater was made more fully than ever the man of power. Especially was he offensive to the Jewish aristocracy, who viewed with increasing jealousy his growing power. Antipater determined, nevertheless, to make himself master of the situation, and in a tour of the country, soon after Caesar's departure, gave the people to understand that they could either accept him and have peace, or by rebellion bring down upon their heads the combined power of himself, Hyrcanus, and the Romans. He then appointed his eldest son, Phasaël, governor of Jerusalem and the places in its vicinity, and Herod, his next son, governor in Galilee.

174. From the very first appearance of the name of this young governor of Galilee interest in him begins and deepens. Restless and daring in spirit, of splendid physique, and with a training and ambition that fitted him to command, he accepted with eagerness the governorship of Galilee, and immediately set about the deliverance of the region from a formidable robber band that for some time had been a terror to the whole country. In this he was completely successful, and won the gratitude of all the inhabitants of northern Palestine as well as that of the Syrian proconsul, Sextus Cæsar. In Jerusalem, however, the affair was looked upon in quite another light. Herod had with summary justice put to death Hezekiah, the chief of the robbers, and many of his band. In so doing he had infringed upon the rights of the Sanhedrin, to which alone belonged the power to pass the death sentence. It was the opportunity for the aristocracy to assert itself and at the same time to check the ambi-

tious designs of the Idumean family. They repeatedly pictured to Hyrcanus the dangerous character of Antipater and his sons, and urged him to summon Herod to trial. At length Hyrcanus yielded, and Herod came to Jerusalem, but not in the garb of a suppliant. Upon the advice of his father, he appeared surrounded with a body-guard and with a purple robe thrown over his bright armor. The Sanhedrin was abashed for a few moments. Not a word was spoken; out of sheer fright they might have allowed Herod to go, had not the celebrated Pharisee, Sameas, aroused the court to a sense of duty by warning them that they would simply insure their own ruin in passing over such defiance of the law. Recovering from the shock of Herod's audacity, they were ready to proceed to his condemnation when Hyrcanus, who had received word from Sextus Cæsar to discharge the prisoner, adjourned the session and secretly warned Herod to get away from the city. Herod withdrew to Damascus and was appointed by Sextus Cæsar military governor of Coele-Syria. He was not the man, however, to submit tamely to such treatment as the Sanhedrin had given him, especially at a time when he believed he had behind him the good-will of the people and the Roman governor. He gathered together his army and marched to Jerusalem with the determination to overthrow Hyrcanus. Only the most urgent appeals of his father and brother prevented him from executing his purpose; and when he returned to Galilee he had the satisfaction of knowing that he had inspired his opponents with a wholesome respect for his power. Virtually the fate of the Hasmonean aristocratic party was now sealed. With this first appearance of the

word "Sanhedrin" in Josephus comes also the last sign of its independence. The prophecy in the warning of Sameas was to have literal fulfilment, and then the Sanhedrin was to become subservient to the powers in command. Though this prophecy of its ruin was uttered by a Pharisee, the Pharisees as a body had withdrawn from active interest in the affairs of state. Their attitude is expressed in the maxim of this same rabbi Sameas, or Shemaiah: "Love work, eschew domination, and hold aloof from the civil power."

175. In view of the fact that Phasaël was in high favor in Jerusalem because of his wise and careful administration, and that Herod was both feared and respected because of his ability and power, Antipater had every reason to congratulate himself upon the strength of his hold upon Judea. Fidelity to the Roman power and a judicious use of opportunities would give him ultimately all he could hope for or wish. Suddenly, on the 15th of March, 44 B. C., the whole world was startled by the assassination of Cæsar. Palestine was involved in the consequent political confusion and became anew the scene of rivalries, intrigues, and war.

176. Mark Antony's decisive action compelled the leaders of the conspiracy to flee from Rome. Of these Brutus turned to Macedonia for help; Cassius to Syria, the governorship of which he had received from Cæsar. He arrived in Syria to find a bitter strife in progress between the partisans of Pompey and Cæsar, but the leaders of both parties were induced to join him, and thus put at his command a large fighting force. In order to get money for their support, he laid heavy taxes upon the cities and provinces. From

Judea he demanded the enormous sum of seven hundred talents, and because Gophna, Emmaus, Lydda, and Thamna failed in their contributions, he sold the inhabitants as slaves. Herod, anxious as ever to further his own interests by keeping the good-will of the Romans, made haste to pay over his share of one hundred talents, and his prompt response gained him not only the governorship of Coele-Syria, but also the promise of the kingship of Judea, if fortune favored the arms of Cassius.

177. For Antipater the outcome was far different. A certain Malichus, a friend of Hyrcanus, strengthened the suspicions of the high-priest that the Idumeans were diligently seeking their own advancement and sought to supplant Antipater in his position of influence. He had not the means nor the power to accomplish this openly, and so he persuaded the butler of Hyrcanus to kill Antipater by poison during the feast to which Hyrcanus had invited them. It was too late, however, to stop the rising power of the Herodian house, as Malichus soon discovered. Furthermore, the dastardly deed took away a man of wisdom and power. There are two possible points of view for estimating the character and work of Antipater. Josephus praises him as a man of piety, justice, and patriotism (Ant. xiv. 11, 4). Bearing in mind the troublous times in which he lived, and the value of his shifting policy in saving the nation from greater oppression, it is possible to understand this tribute. Viewed from the Roman point of outlook, he served Judea, in the main, wisely and well. It nevertheless remains true that he was instrumental, by his strength and self-seeking conduct of affairs, in

bringing his family far along the way toward complete supremacy in Judea, — a result which certainly did not prove a blessing. Malichus, while in the midst of his schemes to secure for himself the government of Judea, paid for his folly by death at the hands of assassins hired by Herod.

178. Meanwhile matters were again coming to a crisis in the Roman world. Octavian, the nephew of Julius Cæsar, was ambitious to take his uncle's place, and joined with Mark Antony against the conspirators. In the autumn of 42 B. C. the hostile armies met at Philippi, and Brutus and Cassius were defeated. The successful leaders divided the sovereignty of the Roman Empire, and Antony became the ruler of the eastern half. The departure of Cassius from Syria in the earlier part of this same year, 42 B. C., had been the signal for the first uprisings in Syria, — one against Phasaël, which he himself vigorously put down, and another by Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, to secure the sovereignty of Palestine, which was frustrated by Herod. The two brothers were virtually now the masters of Judea. Herod had strengthened himself by alliance with the Hasmonean house through his betrothal with Mariamne, the beautiful granddaughter of Hyrcanus. Then came the news of the overthrow of Cassius! The Jewish aristocracy determined to use this opportunity of change in masters to rid the land of these usurpers, and quickly sent deputations to Antony in Bithynia and later in Syria. But Antony had been the friend of Antipater, and Herod himself well knew how to make his plea effective. "Who governs the nation best?" asked Antony of Hyrcanus, who was with the delegation

sent to Syria. "Herod and his party," replied Hyrcanus. "Then shall he and Phasaël be tetrarchs and have full charge of affairs in Judea," declared Antony, and the other indignant delegates were bundled off without ceremony. Again Hyrcanus was stripped of all political authority. He became simply high-priest. For twenty-three years his harmlessness had kept him in the nominal headship of the nation. Not much longer was he to have even that honor, for in a year's time the Parthians came, and an entirely new order of affairs obtained in Palestine.

III

THE LAST OF THE HASMONEANS

179. AMONG all the foreign powers in the East with whom the Romans had contended for mastery, one had proved quite their equal in warlike prowess and valor. That was Parthia. Her terrible horsemen, whose extraordinary expertness in riding was matched by their skill in the use of the bow, were especially dreaded, and, as a rule, the Romans were content to repel their ravages without seeking revenge. Before the battle of Philippi, Cassius had sought their assistance, and although the battle was fatal to the republican cause, still those in sympathy with it persuaded the Parthian King Orodes to make an invasion into Syria. This he did in the year 41 B. C., joining the Romans who were hostile to Antony, and occupying all northern Syria.

180. To Antigonus it seemed the opportune time to make one more final effort to regain the throne. In this purpose he had the cordial seconding of the aristocracy in Jerusalem, who were willing to risk accepting even the rule of the Parthians, for the sake of getting rid of Herod. Accordingly, he made large promises to the Parthian generals, to be fulfilled if they would take the government from Hyrcanus and give it to him, and at the same time kill Herod. The invading army marched southward in two divisions,

Pacorus leading one along the coast, and Barzapharnes the other through the interior. At Mount Carmel Antigonus was met by a company of Jews, who wished to march with him into Judea. All along the way others joined him, until a considerable force supported him in the daily encounters which took place in Jerusalem between his men and the adherents of Herod and Phasaël. ~~Herod~~^{Brother} Herod obtained the first evidence of the dislike of the people toward him, for the multitude which came up to the Feast of Pentecost, held at this time, compelled him to retreat into the fortress on the north side of the temple area, whence he made destructive sallies upon the people encamped in the suburbs. In the mean time a body of Parthian horsemen arrived under the command of Pacorus, the king's cup-bearer, and Antigonus persuaded Phasaël to allow him to enter the city with a few of his horsemen, ostensibly "to still the sedition," but really to persuade Phasaël to go to the camp of Barzapharnes in Galilee, there to arrange the terms of peace. It was but a plot to get possession of Phasaël and Hyrcanus, which was completely successful; for, despite the earnest warnings of Herod, the two princes accompanied Pacorus and were put in irons soon after their arrival in the hostile camp. This was not, however, before they had time to see that all Galilee was in rebellion against the Herods.


181. At Jerusalem two hundred Parthian horsemen and ten of their nobles were, meanwhile, watching the movements of Herod. So successful had been the cup-bearer in deceiving Phasaël that he was sent back to entrap Herod, but the news of the treachery in Galilee preceded him, and Herod, confirmed in all his

suspicious, felt that his only safety was in flight. Secretly and at night he left Jerusalem with his future bride, Mariamne, and the members of his family, accompanied by the troops he then had at command. His objective point was the almost inaccessible fortress of Masada, at the southern end of the Dead Sea. The march was beset with difficulties; and though Herod at first was stout of heart, he was with difficulty dissuaded at one time from taking his own life. At a place where afterward he built a palace fortress, named Herodium, he successfully repelled an attack of the Jews and finally reached Masada, which he put in charge of his brother Joseph (Ant. xiv. 13, 7-9).

182. Antigonus was now master of the situation. His coins were stamped with the title "King" on one side, and "High-Priest" on the other. But he was not the man for the critical position to which he had been suddenly lifted by the Parthians. An exceptional opportunity in the very support of these barbarians was given him for winning the friendship of Rome. The latter power would have unquestionably ignored Herod in its readiness to secure a helpful alliance against these dreaded bowmen. Then, too, the inhabitants in the mountains of Galilee were ready to uphold him, and among other places fortified Sepphoris in his interests. But, as has been truly said, "he was neither a statesman nor a general. His entire energy spent itself in petty concerns, and his overmastering passion was for revenge against Herod." When Hyrcanus and Phasaël were handed over to him by Barzapharnes, he cut off the high-priest's ears to disqualify him from further service, and then had him carried away as a

MAP OF
PALESTINE,
CONTAINING PLACES FOR
ROMAN PERIOD.

0 5 10 20 30
Scale of Miles.



captive by the Parthians, and Phasaël escaped his vengeance only by killing himself (Ant. xiv. 13, 10). While Antigonus was engaged in besieging Masada, events were taking place which were destined to change the whole current of affairs.

183. After leaving his brother in charge of Masada, Herod turned to Petra to get from Malchus, the successor of Aretas, his father's friend, enough money to ransom his brother Phasaël, whom he believed to be still alive. Malchus, from fear of the Parthians, refused to receive him, and the disappointed fugitive hastened on to Egypt. Here he hoped to find Antony, who had given himself up to the enchantments of Cleopatra, and in complete indifference to the inroads of the Parthians, was spending his days in a round of pleasure and dissipation. Again Herod was disappointed, for Antony had at last come to a realization of his danger and had gone to Tyre, the only city in Syria which had not been taken by the Parthians. Cleopatra offered Herod the position of commander in an expedition just then starting out from Egypt, but his ambition was in quite another direction, and, declining all honors, he took ship for Rome. Here he met Antony, who had hastened back to Italy upon learning in Tyre that his wife, Fulvia, had imperilled his position at home by a quarrel with Octavian (Dio Cassius xlviii. 4; Suetonius, "Octavianus" xiv.-xv.). Antony was moved by the recital of Herod's wrongs and hardships, and "partly because he called to mind the friendship he had had with Antipater, partly because Herod offered him money to make him king, but chiefly because of his hatred to Antigonus, whom he took to be a seditious person and an enemy to the

Romans" (Ant. xiv. 14, 4), he promised Herod all needed assistance. This promise was heartily seconded by Octavian, who, before Herod's arrival, had been completely reconciled to Antony. In a meeting of the Senate Herod's case was so urgently presented as worthy of the support of Rome that a decree was unanimously passed making him king of Judea. The happy man left the Senate-house, walking between Antony and Octavian, and went with them to the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol to offer sacrifice, in accordance with the custom of the Roman officials on their entrance upon office (Ant. xiv. 14, 1-5). Perhaps no one was more astonished at the sudden and amazing change in his fortunes than Herod himself. To be sure, he was king only in name, but opportunity and energy might substantiate the name, and so, foregoing all that Rome had to offer him, he left Italy within a week after his arrival. This was in the autumn of the year 40 B. C.

184. In the spring of 39 B. C., he landed at Ptolemais and began the arduous work of conquest. Naturally his first anxiety was for Masada, which was still under siege, but prudence demanded that he should not at first strike across a hostile country, leaving enemies to gather in from all sides behind him. The plundering of the Parthians in Galilee had created a state of unrest which turned to his advantage, and as he advanced down through the country, his army grew larger each day. As soon as this northern province was brought under control, he turned his attention to Joppa, another strategic point upon his march toward the south, and one particularly hostile to him (Ant. xv. 15, 1). The city soon capitulated, and

then the way was open to Masada, which was speedily and easily relieved. His success itself now became attractive, and many came to his standard for what they hoped to gain from him when he actually became king. Hitherto the Romans had given him but indifferent assistance.

185. He felt himself, however, strong enough to move upon the capital, and pitched his camp on the west side of Jerusalem. Had Silo, the Roman general, vigorously supported him, the capture of the city would have been an easy achievement, but the bribes of Antigonus induced the Roman to cause delay by setting his troops to clamor for supplies and to insist upon withdrawing into winter quarters. They even plundered the city of Jericho, where Herod had gathered for them a quantity of provisions, and then they refused to act until spring. But Herod himself took no rest. With a vigor and ingenuity characteristic of him, he subdued the large robber bands which infested the mountains of Galilee, and at the same time provided against any possible revolutions in Idumea by sending his brother Joseph with a large detachment of troops to oversee that section (Ant. xiv. 15, 4, 5).

186. While Herod was busy in Galilee, Silo was summoned to help Ventidius repel a first attack of the Parthians upon Syria, and as soon as this was accomplished, a large detachment under the command of a general Machærus was sent to the assistance of Herod. Double-dealing on the part of this leader made Herod very angry, and he lost all hope of proper help and advancement, unless he made appeal directly to Antony, who just at this time was engaged in the

siege of Samosata, a city near the Euphrates. Both on the way and at Samosata itself, Herod's skill and bravery placed Antony under fresh obligations to him, and Sosius, the successor of Ventidius, was commanded to see to it that Herod had efficient assistance (Ant. xiv. 15, 7-9).

187. A speedy settlement of the contest for the throne seemed now possible, but Herod, upon his return, found that he had lost all that had been gained before his departure. His brother Joseph, contrary to express instructions, had risked an engagement with Antigonus near Jericho, in which he was defeated and slain. Antigonus sent his head to Herod. The victory had again aroused the Galileans, who had drowned in the lake many of Herod's adherents. When one adds to these calamities the fact of threatening unrest in Idumea, the outlook was dark enough. With his accustomed resoluteness, however, Herod began over again, and soon had Galilee under control. At Isana, a little north of Bethel, he gained the mastery of the whole land, except Jerusalem, by a decisive and bloody victory over a part of the forces of Antigonus. The head of the defeated general, Pappus, was sent to Antigonus in revenge for the treatment of Joseph. Only the coming on of winter prevented him from attacking Jerusalem (Ant. xiv. 15, 11, 12).

188. In the spring of 37 B. C. the siege of the capital began, and Herod followed the tactics of Pompey. The suburbs were destroyed, and orders were given for the erection of military engines with which to assault the north side of the city. While these were being constructed, Herod himself went into Samaria to celebrate his marriage with Mariamne, to whom he

had been betrothed five years before. It was an event well timed to make his accession more palatable, if possible, for it gave him the advantage of the connection with the Hasmonean house.

189. Upon his return to Jerusalem, Sosius appeared with a large force, and the two leaders made a joint attack upon the city. They met with determined resistance, for the people were not only opposing the entrance of a hated Idumean, but they were holding on in the lively hope that Messianic deliverance would be sent to them (Ant. xiv. 16, 2). Only two voices were heard in favor of opening the city gates, — those of Shemaia and Abtalion, — who looked upon Herod as a chastisement upon the nation for its sinfulness (Ant. xv. 1, 1). Forty days after the beginning of the attack, and in the fifth month after preparations for the siege had begun, the outer rampart was taken, and after fifteen more, the second. Then came the storming of the inner court of the temple and the upper city. The slaughter was terrible. The Romans were enraged over the prolonged siege, and in their fury they were matched by the Jews who fought with Herod. The streets ran blood; and it was only by entreaties and threatenings that Herod saved the temple from pollution, — a deed which he knew would never be forgiven him. Antigonus, in his extremity, cast himself at the feet of the Roman general and begged for mercy. His tears and pleadings won only the scorn of Sosius, who, in ridicule, as though he were a mere woman, called him Antigona, and put him in chains. Nor was this all. He was taken bound to Antony at Antioch, and by the earnest appeal of Herod was put to death. As though he

were a common criminal, he was first scourged and then beheaded. Never before had the Romans in such an ignominious fashion put a king to death. The noble house that for nearly one hundred and thirty years had wrought so much for Judea, ended in shame and contempt. "They wore the diadem of the king and the mitre of the high-priest, but no self-conquest had crowned and mitred them over themselves. They had come to think less of their country than of their dynasty, and less of their religion than of their personal interests;" and so they were carried out upon the tide of ambition into the ceaseless current of political rivalry and strife, to go down at last at the hands of the very power to which they had more than once appealed for protection.

IV

HEROD, THE KING OF THE JEWS

(37-4 B. C.)

190. WHEN the Roman army marched away with Antigonus as a prisoner, Herod's title of "King" was no longer empty. He was "the master of a city in ruins and the king of a nation that hated him." His long, eventful reign was a complex of brilliant achievements and fearful crimes. His hands were never free from the stain of blood, and yet those hands made Jerusalem glorious in the architecture of palace and temple, and changed the face of the land by many a costly improvement. The very Hellenism which, in its extreme form, Antiochus Epiphanes had tried to force upon the nation, was in all its secular features established by Herod in various parts of the land, and that, too, without a single uprising. The theatre and amphitheatre formed a part of the attractions of the capital, whose court life and interests kept the city in touch with the outside world. Almost within sound of the solemn service of worship, in the temple, took place furious chariot races and the cruel, demoralizing fights of foreign gladiators; while heathen temples at Paneas and Cæsarea showed how like in faith to the mad Antiochus this "Idumean slave," as the Jews called him, really was. Indeed, the sharp contrasts that might be seen in the life of Jerusalem were but symbolical of

the contrasts in the character of Herod himself. He was intensely selfish and yet could be splendidly generous; he was strong in purpose, and yet the easy victim of weakening suspicions; he loved the means of culture and yet revealed the revengeful cruelty of a veritable barbarian.

191. As we turn to the unfolding of the history of his rulership, it will be well to keep in mind the two guiding principles of his whole career: the safeguarding of his own supremacy and the strengthening of the favor of the Romans. In one or the other of these is found the impulse to his every action. "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown." Never was this proverb truer than in the case of this last sovereign in Jerusalem. The success which he had achieved in the realization of his ambition to be king had been won at the expense of the enmity of the people, of the nobility in Jerusalem, of the survivors of the Hasmonean house, and of Cleopatra. In the plots and counterplots born of this deadly hatred, much of his time and energy for twelve years, from 37 to 25 B. C., was consumed. The people he treated with consideration, as far as their religious demands were concerned, for he himself had no vital interest in religion of any form or description; but he dealt with all resistance to his authority with the utmost rigor. He was prompt, decisive, and relentless.

192. Almost his first act after the Romans had gone was to put to death forty-five of the nobles who had supported Antigonus, and then to confiscate their property that he might have means to strengthen his hold upon Antony and to gratify his own luxurious tastes. By one treacherous blow the Sanhedrin was thus struck

down, only Shemaia and Abtalion, the Pharisees who had counselled the opening of the city gates, being spared. In general, Herod had little to fear from the Pharisees. Although six thousand of them refused to take the oath of allegiance to him, their voluntary withdrawal from political authority left him in a measure free to work out his own political projects. They looked with increasing expectation for the Messianic day of deliverance, and had only haughty scorn for the presumption of the whole dynasty of the Herods. When the new Sanhedrin was convoked, a goodly number of them took their places in its solemn conclave, as did, indeed, such Sadducees as had accommodated themselves to the new order of affairs in Jerusalem. The accession of Herod marks the beginning of a new phase in the history of these two great parties. His policy and procedure made impossible any longer open warfare, and they were compelled to satisfy themselves with discussion over mooted points of theological casuistry. In these discussions the Sadducees were no match for their learned opponents and were soon silenced.

193. In order to have affairs more completely under his control, he took upon himself the appointment of the high-priest, and placed in this position of dignity and authority an obscure priest from Babylon, named Ananel. With this appointment began the long series of troubles and calamities brought upon him by the survivors of the Hasmonean family. Hyrcanus could never again fill the sacred office because of the mutilation he had suffered; but Herod was not content to leave him in Babylon, whither he had been sent by the Parthians and where he had been highly honored. He

was invited to return to Jerusalem and treated with much honor by Herod, who by his flattering attentions masked his real intention of bringing the aged Hasmonean within the range of his own authority and espionage and of thus guarding against any possible demonstration in his favor. From him there was now nothing to be feared. This was not the case with Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus. It was to her an intolerable outrage that an unknown Babylonian Jew should be appointed to the high-priesthood when her son, Aristobulus III., fair in person and of the royal lineage, had every reason to receive it (Ant. xv. 2, 1-5).

194. She at once began to work out her design of compelling Herod to give her son the honor, and wrote to Cleopatra for assistance in bringing Antony over to the support of her son's claim. Mariamne, the sister of Aristobulus III., also urged upon Herod the rightfulness of her brother's desire. Pictures of the fair brother and beautiful sister were sent to Antony with an evil purpose, but he feared both the hatred of Herod and the jealousy of Cleopatra, and so wrote to Herod to favor the young man, if he could do so without giving offence. In the circumstances Herod decided to accede to the wishes of Alexandra, and in the beginning of 35 B. C. appointed Aristobulus, though only in his seventeenth year, high-priest. The appointment was in itself illegal, for Herod had no right to depose Ananel, whose rightful term of service was for life. Furthermore, it cast over Aristobulus himself the shadow of death. Alexandra, by her intrigues, had opened that fatal door into Herod's mind through which the darkest suspicions evermore had ready entrance, and she was the first to suffer from her own

rash ambitions. She was imprisoned in the palace in Jerusalem, and, on the discovery of a plot to escape with her son to Cleopatra, marked for death. Herod now waited for a suitable time to put them both out of the way.

195. The jealousy of the king hastened the issue for Aristobulus. At the Feast of Tabernacles, the tall, stately figure of the young man in his priestly robes aroused the greatest enthusiasm among the people, and their hearty acclamations and expressions of goodwill revealed to the suspicious king the danger which threatened him. A few days after, they were both in Jericho at a feast given by Alexandra; and while seeking refreshment from the heat by a bath in one of the large fish-ponds near the palace, Aristobulus, under pretence of sport, was held under the water by paid servants of Herod and drowned. No one was louder in his lamentations than the king himself, and a costly funeral seems to have made complete the deception of the people (Ant. xv. 3, 2-4).

196. Alexandra, however, understood the treachery, but, dissembling her abhorrence and hatred, secretly sought again the help of Cleopatra, who prevailed upon Antony to summon Herod before him to answer for his treacherous murder. It was a time of keen suspense for the king. If he failed to keep the goodwill of Antony, his kingship was worth but little, and two determined enemies, Cleopatra and Alexandra, were in league against him. So uncertain was he of the issue, that upon his departure he gave command that Mariamne should be put to death in case he did not return, so that Antony might not get possession of her (Ant. xv. 3, 4).

197. Antony was at this time, 34 B. C., in Laodicea, south of Antioch, making preparations ostensibly against the Parthians, but really against the Armenians. He was still under the fascination of the Egyptian queen, who was using all her arts to get possession of Judea. Only Antony's appreciation of Herod had so far frustrated her design. Herod well knew how much depended upon his appearance before his Roman master, and by skilful address and lavish gifts he won the day (Ant. xv. 3, 8).

198. In the mean time rumor had it that Antony had put him to death. This false report encouraged Alexandra to plan, through the charms of Mariamne, to induce Antony to raise her to the throne, when letters came from Herod telling of his success. Mariamne was as little rejoiced over this sudden change of outlook as was Alexandra, for the talkative Joseph had let out the secret about Herod's commands to kill her if he did not return. Herod, as soon as he reached Jerusalem, was told of the plans of Alexandra, and made to believe that Mariamne's knowledge of his secret command was gained through shameless infidelity. Salome, his sister, was chiefly instrumental in deepening the suspicions against his wife, whom she hated, and only the deep, abiding affection of Herod saved Mariamne from death. Alexandra was imprisoned, and the telltale Joseph put to death without even a hearing (Ant. xv. 3, 9). With the entrance of Salome upon the scene, we have the "three furies who, in the guise of evil women, with their ambitions, jealousies, and lusts, swept down from the first like harpies" upon the public and private peace of Herod.

199. Antony had sent the king back to Jerusalem triumphant, but Cleopatra could not be totally denied, and she became the possessor of all the cities south of the Eleutherus River as far as Egypt, except Tyre and Sidon; of a part of the Arabian territory, and of the region about Jericho, famous for its palm-trees and balsams. With no good grace Herod leased this last district from Cleopatra, and when she came into Judea on her return from accompanying Antony to the Euphrates, he had a mind to put her to death and thus rid both Antony and himself of her persistent scheming. While in Judea she tried all her seductive arts upon the king, but without success. Herod pretended to take her proposals seriously, and, in fact, consulted his council regarding a fitting rejoinder, but contented himself with escorting her with every manifestation of dignity and display to the boundaries of Egypt.

200. Meanwhile a crisis was drawing near which was again to affect the fortunes of the whole Roman world. Rome itself was getting heartily tired of the strange, unseemly doings of Antony. His extravagant folly and Oriental airs awakened the strongest resentment, and when in 32 B.C., Octavian, his colleague, openly denounced him in the Senate, all were ready for action. When hostilities began, Herod hastened to support his old friend Antony, but by a scheme of Cleopatra's he was turned aside to punish the Arabian king who had failed to pay the queen his tribute. The purpose of this diversion was not so much the tribute as the war, which should so weaken both contestants that she herself might easily assert her power over them. It all turned out to Herod's gain, for not only did he, after several discouraging experiences, gain a

complete victory over his enemies, but he was also saved from any direct action against Octavian (Ant. xv. 5, 1-5).

201. In the sea fight off the promontory of Actium on September 2, 31 B. C., Antony's forces were defeated and Octavian became the sole master of Rome's destinies. It was again a critical moment for Herod. He yet believed in Antony and urged him to put Cleopatra to death and seek some compromise with Octavian. This the infatuated Roman would not do, and Herod resolved to support him no longer. It was in reality no difficult matter for him to change his allegiance. Already he had done it three times, and yet Antony seemed to understand him so little as to count upon his unfailing support. When, in addition to all other reports which came to Antony daily at Alexandria of the desertion of this or that leader, word was finally brought that Herod had also abandoned him, he gave up all thoughts of continued resistance and in the course of the year committed suicide (Ant. xv. 6, 7; Plutarch, "Antonius").

202. As soon as Herod's resolution was taken to support Octavian, he sought opportunity to prove his new allegiance. This came to him in connection with a troop of gladiators who had assembled at Cyzicus, and were waiting to take part in the games which were to be celebrated in honor of Antony's victory over Octavian. Upon the news of the issue of the battle, they determined to hasten to Egypt to the assistance of their defeated master. Herod forbade their crossing his territory, and they were compelled to surrender to the proconsul of Syria, who had held them in siege at Daphnæ. Before, however, Herod could

undertake an interview with Octavian, he felt that he must secretly guard in his absence against an attempt on the part of those around him to raise any rival to power. The aged Hyrcanus was really the object of his fears, not because he would himself make trouble, but because he was an Hasmonean and could be readily used by the people. Hence a disgraceful plot was devised to bring about the death of the aged prince. Hyrcanus was accused of conniving with the Arabian king and ruthlessly butchered. Among Herod's many shameless deeds this one takes high rank. It was as uncalled for as it was cruel, and deepened the hatred of many against him.

203. Octavian was at Rhodes, and thither Herod journeyed, after having placed various members of his family at Masada for safe-keeping, and his wife and her mother at Alexandria under the charge of his treasurer, Joseph, and a certain Sohemus of Iturea. These arrangements are noteworthy because of the results that came from them. Herod put on a bold face before Octavian. His fidelity to Antony he made the very reason why Octavian should accept him. The shrewd Roman had other reasons of far greater import to himself. He knew Herod's skill and strength, and such an ally between Egypt, Arabia, and Syria could be of inestimable service. He therefore graciously accepted his allegiance, confirmed him in his royal rank, and obtained from the Senate a decree making his kingship secure. Herod was gratified beyond all his expectations, and returned in triumphant mood to Jerusalem. Elaborate preparations for the supply of the Roman army and for the proper escort of Octavian from Ptolemais to the borders of Egypt converted all

the soldiers into enthusiastic friends of the new ally, and helped to win from Octavian the restoration of the districts about Jericho, Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, and Straton's Tower. In gratitude for these gifts, Herod again escorted Octavian, after his conquest of Egypt, as far as Antioch. Perhaps on this ride Herod was accompanied by the old body-guard of Cleopatra, consisting of four hundred Gauls, also a present from Octavian.

204. Amid the pomp and display of the days of attendance upon his patron, Herod was full of the joy and pride of his marvellous good fortune. At the threshold of his palace the chill shadow of suspicion fell again upon him, and his days were again darkened by wretchedness and crime. Unwilling to learn from experience, he had a second time given the command to have Mariamne put to death if he did not return from his visit to Octavian. Neither she nor her mother Alexandra had relished imprisonment in the fortress of Alexandrium, and Sohemus proved as faithless as formerly Joseph had been in keeping Herod's command a secret. Mariamne deeply resented the wicked will of her intensely jealous husband, and let him feel the keen edge of her resentment. The unhappy king was racked with the conflict of love and anger, and was completely in doubt as to what to do. All this had taken place before the news had come that Antony and Cleopatra were both dead, and that Octavian was victor in Egypt. The brief time of Herod's absence in Egypt and the charm of accompanying Octavian to Antioch gave him relief for a while from the deepening trouble of his home. That trouble, however, was meanwhile being swiftly aggravated by the contempt-

nous pride of Mariamne, who despised the sister of Herod, and by the implacable hatred of this sister, Salome, who plotted the death of her enemy. After Herod's mind had been sufficiently saturated with suspicion, the time came for action, and his cup-bearer, in accordance with careful instructions from Salome, appeared before Herod with a love-potion which he said Mariamne had given him for the king, and whose composition he did not know. In his professed ignorance was the very sting of suspicion. Herod was startled, and had Mariamne's eunuch examined by torture in reference to the matter. The wretched man knew nothing of the poisonous mixture, but he did know what Mariamne had heard from the faithless Sohemus, and that was enough. As before, Herod looked upon the knowledge of his secret command as a proof of unfaithfulness. Sohemus was at once executed. Mariamne was tried, condemned, and soon after led out to execution. The beautiful woman met her death with a fortitude worthy of her Maccabean lineage (Ant. xv. 7, 2-6).

205. The effect of this sad and awful deed upon Herod was terrible. To drown the pangs of remorse, he resorted to feasting and then to hunting, and in the overstraining of his energies brought on an illness at Samaria, which for a time unhinged his reason and seriously threatened his life. Alexandra, the cause of much of the pitiable king's troubles, was on the alert to further her own interests, and tried to get possession of the two fortified places in Jerusalem, but was unsuccessful. When the news of her attempt was reported to Herod, it so aroused him as to break the hold of the disease, and he ordered Alexandra to be put to death

without delay (28 B. C.). Soon after, Costobar, the second husband of Salome, was discovered to be guarding and training the sons of Babas, distant relatives of the Hasmonean house, whom Herod had long been looking for, and they were all immediately put to death. At last the work was done. "Now none was left of the kindred of Hyrcanus, and the kingdom was entirely in Herod's own power; no one was remaining of such high position as could interfere with what he did against the Jewish laws" (Ant. xv. 7, 9-10).

V

HEROD UNDER AUGUSTUS

206. FOR many years the Roman world had been moving toward that issue which came in the supremacy of Augustus, — an absolute despotism. A century of civil wars had created necessities which only a single ruling authority could meet. Once and again unlimited power had been given in emergencies to dictators, consuls, and triumvirates, but only for a special purpose and for a limited time. Even Augustus, as Octavian was now called, was granted imperial rule for ten years, and it was only due to his adroitness that he did not give offence by assuming more than a temporary supremacy. Julius Caesar had fallen because he made known his wish to take to himself sovereign power, and Augustus had studied well the causes of his predecessor's failure. Nevertheless he had from the first the ambition to be the controlling will in the realm, and in keeping with his cold, calculating nature he made haste slowly. Tacitus tells us his method of procedure: "Renouncing the title of triumvir for that of consul, Augustus, for the purpose of protecting the people, was at first contented with the power of a tribune. Soon afterwards, having gained the soldiers by his largesses, the people by distributions of food, and all orders of the state by the sweets of peace, he grew bolder by degrees and drew to himself without opposition the whole power

of the Senate, the magistrates, and the laws. The bravest of the nobility had perished in battle or by proscription; the rest, won over to servitude by riches and honors, preferred the present with its safety to the past with its dangers. These changes did not displease the provinces; they dreaded the rule of the Senate and people on account of the rival ambitions and cupidity of the magistrates, who were feebly checked by laws which were powerless against violence, corruption, and wealth" (*Annales* i. 2).

207. When Augustus returned to Rome in the autumn of 29 B. C., he began those great changes in the organization of the empire which contributed to his own strength and to the satisfaction of the provinces. Judea at first was not much affected, because of the kingship of Herod. Herod's twofold relation, however, to Augustus on the one side, and to Palestine on the other, determined his course of action in all public affairs.

208. In addition to the proper management of the kingdom of Judea, Augustus laid upon Herod two large duties requiring energy and care. One resulted from the peculiar position of Herod's kingdom; the other from the unifying policy of the emperor. In considering the question of the eastern boundaries of his dominion, Augustus had no sympathy with the former ambitions of Caesar and Antony to carry these boundaries beyond the Euphrates. He saw rather in the countries bounding the Mediterranean the natural limits of such an empire as he wished to realize. Egypt, Syria, and Arabia were part of, or adjacent to, the line of limitation, and the strength and skill of Herod were vital to the maintenance of authority and stability

along this frontier. Consequently, Herod's territory was gradually enlarged until he was ruler over a larger kingdom than ever before had been governed from Jerusalem. It was also the pleasure of the great Roman to follow out Alexander's method for the unification of his empire, as far as its inner life and thought were concerned, by bringing all its diverse elements face to face with the customs and thinking of that broad Hellenism which had gathered into itself the best products of various lands and times. Herod was a willing servant of Augustus in this far-reaching project, not from any innate love of culture, indeed, but rather from the glory it brought him and the fresh interests it opened up to him. The working out of these wishes of his patron made the history of this brilliant period (25-13 B. C.) of his reign an Augustan age in Judea upon a small scale.

209. After the last possible Hasmonean rival had been put out of the way, Herod began to introduce innovations as offensive to his Jewish subjects as they were acceptable to his master, Augustus. Games in honor of the emperor were instituted to be observed every fourth year. "In crowds the Greeks streamed up to these festivals in order to carry off the rich prizes offered by the king in the various kinds of forbidden arts and in the two and four horse chariot races, from the Jews, who were unpractised in such abominations." Greek plays of blasphemous character were the attractions of the theatre in Jerusalem. A veritable tidal wave of heathenism swept over the city. It is interesting to note that some of the Pharisees, true to their concern for the letter of the law, focussed their indignation upon some trophies in the form of suits of armor

placed about the theatre. "They are the images of men," they cried, "and a violation of the law." When the pieces were taken down and the wooden posts that supported them made bare, they were satisfied, even though their conduct was made ridiculous. Others were determined that Herod should suffer death for his heathenish innovations, and a plot was formed to murder him in the theatre. A spy revealed the whole plan to Herod, and the rash venture cost many lives (Ant. xv. 8, 1-4).

210. It would have been an unpardonable shortcoming, in the judgment of Augustus, if Herod had not been able to maintain order within his own kingdom, and yet if the public pulse was revealed in the nefarious plot which had just been exposed and which was regarded by the conspirators as a "pious action," there was great risk of turbulence and even open rebellion. Consequently Herod began the establishment of those fortresses which should protect himself and "hem in the multitude" (Ant. xv. 8, 4).

211. Already in the time of Antony the temple-fortress had been rebuilt and called Antonia; and Herod's palace in the city was not only a marvel of costliness and luxury, but also a fortification, so that at Jerusalem he was well guarded. To secure himself in other parts of the land, Samaria was made a fortress of the first rank; Straton's Tower was strengthened; Gaba in Galilee and Hesbon in the Perea were fortified. Indeed, to use the words of Josephus, "he was surrounding the whole nation with garrisons that they might by no means get out of his power, nor fall into tumults" (Ant. xv. 8, 5). Furthermore, he covered the land with a network of spies, who were to report to

him all seditious opinions or criticisms upon his government. He did not hesitate even to degrade himself by prowling about the streets of Jerusalem in disguise for the same purpose. All large gatherings of the people were forbidden; torture was resorted to in order to force suspects to tell what they knew. Many were hurried away to the prisons of the fortresses and there put to death. The people were simply terrorized into submission (Ant. xv. 10, 4).

212. As one contemplates facts like these, it is difficult to understand how there could be any bright side to what seems an intolerable despotism. And yet there was a glory in the Herodian age, as there was in that of his patron Augustus, who thoroughly understood, if he did not teach to Herod, some of the king's despicable ways of knowing the temper of his subjects. With all determination to force upon the people a quiet mind, if they would have it in no other way, Herod earnestly desired to give them the real advantages of a well-managed government. The better impulses of the man were brought to light in the famine and pestilence which in the year 25 B. C. brought upon Palestine great suffering and loss of life. He threw himself into the work of providing relief with the utmost energy, nor did he hesitate, when in need of money for supplies, to sell the costly furniture of his palace in order to procure corn from Egypt. His friendship with Petronius, the governor of Egypt, made readily accessible to him the stores of the Nile valley, and it is estimated that he distributed altogether eight hundred thousand Attic measures of corn, while whole villages were provided with clothing against the rigors of winter. The splendid man-

agement of this really great enterprise brought him fame abroad, and for a while softened the hearts of his subjects (Ant. xv. 9, 1, 2).

213. As showing, however, how little he really cared, after all, for the continued good-will of the people, he suddenly changed the occupant of the high-priest's office, solely that he might give greater dignity to an Alexandrian family in which was a beautiful girl whom he was resolved to marry. Not only did this deed contribute to the degradation of the sacred office, but this very family—the Boethusim—became, for the short time that it held high official station, a malignant influence in the nation (Ant. xv. 9, 4). To the last he followed his own inclinations in so far as they did not bring him into conflict with his Roman master. He lived, planned, and worked for Herod's sake. His ambitions, when realized, brought large material enrichment to his extensive kingdom, but they all terminated in the supreme vision of his own glorification.

214. It was as a result of his twofold obligation to Augustus (see sect. 208) that much of his passion for building found expression. A cordon of fortresses for the protection of his frontiers was among his first public works. Beginning at Jerusalem, they were placed at strategic points with reference both to resisting outer and suppressing inner foes. Cities were built on the Roman model and dignified with foreign names. Such were Antipatris, Agrippæum, Sebaste (Samaria), and Cæsarea. In these cities of his own creation he allowed himself entire freedom in the recognition of heathen deities and in the deification of the emperor. Near the port of Cæsarea, on an emi-

nence which made it visible far out at sea, stood a temple with a colossal statue of Augustus, equalling that of Jupiter at Olympia, and another of the goddess of Rome, like that of Juno at Argos. One god was as good as another, and Augustus better than all to this godless ruler, who so filled the Gentile portions of his kingdom with statues and temples that "it was unnecessary to travel far up into the country in order to learn that Jehovah had to endure many gods besides himself in his own land." Nor did he confine to Palestine his zeal for promoting the life of Hellenism. With lavish hand he dealt out the revenues from his subjects to adorn foreign cities. For the Rhodians he built a Pythian temple; in Nicopolis, a city founded by Augustus near Actium, he put up a large part of the public buildings, and Antioch remembered him for the colonnades which he built along both sides of her principal thoroughfare (Ant. xvi. 5, 3). Tripolis, Damascus, and Ptolemais were indebted to him for gymnasia; Berytus and Tyre for market-places; Byblus for a wall, cloisters, and temple; Sidon and Damascus for theatres; Laodicea for an aqueduct, and the whole Hellenistic world for his rehabilitation of the Olympic games (J. W. i. 21, 11). Well might Augustus say, in view of all this, "that the dominions of Herod were too little for the greatness of his soul," and that "he deserved to have the kingdom of all Syria and of Egypt also" (Ant. xvi. 5, 1). All Syria and Egypt together would have found the cost of such unmeasured extravagance intolerable. How much more the comparatively small kingdom which had to sustain it!

215. While making such demands upon the people,

Herod was alert to increase in every possible way the productiveness of the country. He established new commercial centres and gave a continual stimulus to trade. The greatest achievement of his reign in this direction was the building of Cæsarea. One of the marked features of the Palestinian coast-line is its inhospitable character. From Carmel to the Egyptian delta it shuts out the sea, offering at only one or two points the faintest welcome in the way of a passable harbor. The Jews had but one harbor, such as it was, on that long sea-line, and that was at Joppa. Great had been their exultation when, in the days of the Maccabees, they had made themselves masters of it (I. Mac. xiv. 5). Its changeful fortunes have already been noted, but it is well to bear in mind that among all the chief towns of the maritime plain which came under the governorship of Herod, it alone was thoroughly Jewish in sympathy and tone. It reflected the spirit of Jerusalem, with which it was in close connection. For this reason Herod seems to have kept away from Joppa, and in seeking a site for the construction of a harbor to have preferred to put it in closer relation with Sebaste than with Jerusalem, for Sebaste was nearer the sea.

216. Slowly, through twelve years, the work was carried forward which placed a city of royal quality beside a haven of such noble proportions that in later days Cæsarea was spoken of as "The Cæsarea by the August Harbor" (coin of Nero). This harbor was wholly artificial, being formed by a mole two hundred feet wide, which was built of immense stones piled upon each other till the mass rose to considerable height above the sea. One half of the exposed

surface was left in the rough as a breakwater. Upon the other, one hundred feet in width, was built a wall with several towers and with arches which served as lodgings for sailors. A broad quay extended around the entire haven and was "a most desirable walk to those who desired exercise." The entrance was on the north, and when within the port, which was of the size of the Piræus at Athens, ships were securely protected from the sea, which every day was stirred into tumult by the wide sweep of the wind. Its splendid harbor made Cæsarea the virtual capital of Palestine, and its impulse to commerce was strong and undiminished as long as the western world had an interest in the land (Ant. xv. 9, 6).

217. With all this increasing material splendor, the Hellenizing developments in the court of Herod kept pace. He was himself by education a Greek, and his palace was the focal point in Jerusalem of all the social and literary interests of a foreign culture. Greek scholars and artists were his intimate friends and advisers. Notable among these was Nicolas of Damascus, a man of wide and varied learning, yet withal a skilful diplomatist and finished courtier. His history was one of the best sources for the records of Josephus (see especially books xv.-xvii.), and his fame in science and philosophy was wide-spread. Beside him stood Ptolemy, his brother, also of foreign training, chief chancellor and keeper of the king's seals, and a trusted councillor in state affairs. These were the noblest specimens of a group of men who kept the tone of the court out of harmony with the aims and sympathies of the nation, and that lack of harmony was increased by the company of sycophants and hangers-on who were

willing to sacrifice anything for the promotion of their own interests, which could best be served in all the objectionable schemes of Herod's Hellenistic policy. There was little in the influences radiating from Herod's palace consonant with the spirit of Judaism.

218. Despite, however, his wilfulness, Herod wanted to be known among the Romans as a popular sovereign. In his adroit speech to the people, when he proposed to them the building of a new temple, he aimed to make it appear that all his building hitherto had been for their highest advantage (*Ant.* xv. 11, 1), and he hoped by this supreme architectural achievement to offset the irritation of burdensome taxation and foreign intrusion. This was not his only motive, but it gave strong emphasis to those personal reasons which were always prompting him to action. It is possible, as another has suggested, that he sought to make political capital out of Jewish beliefs connected with the temple and the Messianic hopes. The words of the prophecy of Haggai (ii. 3-9) and the comparatively recent predictions of the Book of Enoch (*xci.* 12), spoke of "that house" whose glory should transcend all former temples. If he could fulfil these prophesyings, what might it not mean for his own name and for the gratification of the people!

219. In the fifteenth year of his reign he called a great assembly of the people to make to them his astounding proposition. His disappointment over its reception must have been keen. Distrust and fear suggested the dark purpose of depriving them in this way of the temple altogether, or, if not that, insuperable difficulties in the execution of his designs. Herod skilfully met all objections, and the work began in

elaborate provisions for the actual construction. A thousand wagons were built for carrying stone, ten thousand workmen were engaged in preparing material, and one thousand priests were taught to work as masons and carpenters, that no polluted hands might make the sacred courts unclean. Eight years were consumed in the construction of the vast surroundings of the temple proper, which itself required the careful work of eighteen months. During the whole time worship was never interrupted, and Herod himself punctiliously respected the ceremonial restriction which forbade a foreigner entering the inner courts. He chose the anniversary of his accession as the day of consecration. With imposing ritual and amid universal rejoicings the noble structure was given to the worship of Jehovah (Ant. xv. 11, 2, 6).

220. Josephus has given us in his *Antiquities* (xv. 11, 3-5) and in *The Jewish War* (v. 5, 1-6) a full description of the approaches, courts, porticoes, gates, and chambers of the sacred area. The whole made a picture upon which the eyes of the people were feasted, and the excellence of its beauty caused the rabbis to say that "whoever had not seen the temple of Herod had seen nothing beautiful." It is not strange, therefore, that tradition sought to place upon it the mark of divine approval by telling of the conduct of the weather during the whole time of construction. The rain fell then only at night, and each morning under cloudless skies the work went on (Ant. xv. 11, 7). Judaism appropriated this temple as a worthy expression of her religious devotion, and with new emphasis upon her zeal for the outward and the ceremonial filled its courts with admiring worshippers. On beyond the

days of our Lord, workmen were kept busy making additions or perfecting parts of the adornment. The whole was not completely finished until 64 A. D., just when the storm-clouds of war were gathering over Judea by whose final outburst the whole temple area was strewn with hopeless ruin.

221. Once more, just after the consecration of the temple, the puzzling contradictions in Herod's character were illustrated. For years he had carefully refrained from passing a forbidden line in the sacred courts; now he insisted upon placing a large golden eagle, the emblem of heathen Rome, over the great gate of the temple. Gratitude was turned into fierce indignation, and the eagle doomed to destruction at the first favorable opportunity. So amid intense, alternating emotions in the hearts of his subjects this strange man moved on to his end.

VI

IN THE DAYS OF HEROD THE KING

222. THE Palestine of 10 B. C. was virtually the Palestine of our Lord's ministry. Its material glory, its wide-reaching material interests, its foreign admixtures, its intensified hopes and fears, — all these were what they were because of the tireless ambition of the brilliant, barbaric king who then ruled Judea. The hopeless task, which Herod undertook, of trying to make the Jews an integral part of the Græco-Roman world brought him only bitterness of soul and the people immeasurable misery. His splendid buildings and large-minded plans for national prosperity, nay, more, his rigorous, stern administration, could not overcome the indomitable spirit of Judaism. Could he have ended his career when the loud hosannas of the day of the temple's consecration expressed the joy and thanksgiving of the people, the harshness of his selfish life might have been softened, but, alas! he lived on to do dark deeds and at last to put the impress of his blood-stained hands upon the opening page of the world's gospel.

223. The purpose of Augustus, in which Herod so readily acquiesced, of opening his kingdom to the full sway of foreign ideals, was one that must be carried on when Herod was no more. Accordingly Herod sent his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, chil-

dren by the murdered Mariamne, to Rome to breathe in the spirit of the Hellenism which they must foster. Every advantage of the imperial capital was open to them. They were the pupils of Asinius Pollio, the friend of Virgil, and through him came into contact with Rome's brilliant social and literary coteries. They themselves had grown to be tall, noble-looking men, conscious of the royal blood in their veins and eager to vindicate the honor of their unfortunate mother. Judea awaited with affectionate interest the arrival of these descendants of the house they had in times past loved to honor. The day of their coming to the capital in the year 17 B. C. was, however, a day big with fate to Herod and his household. Salome soon realized what she must expect from these haughty princes, if ever they came to power, and diligently she began again her old methods of calumny and false witness. Herod's suspicious nature struggled with his genuine affection, and he tried by suitable marriages to stay the mischief that proud contempt on one side and revengeful hatred on the other were working out between these young princes and Pheroras, Cypros, and Salome. To Alexander, the elder brother, was given Glaphyra, the daughter of the king of Cappadocia, and to Aristobulus, Bernice, the daughter of Salome (Ant. xvi. 1, 2).

224. Hoping for better results from this new adjustment of domestic affairs, Herod hastened to Asia to meet Agrippa, the commissioner of Augustus for the eastern provinces, and to invite him to come to Judea. Next to the coming of Augustus himself was prized the visit of this royal minister, and Herod forgot his family troubles in his pleasure and pride in

conducting Agrippa about Cæsarea to Sebaste, to the strong fortresses, and finally to Jerusalem. The Roman official was simply amazed at what he saw. It surpassed all his expectations, and each day of his stay in Jerusalem found him at the temple, wondering at the stately ritual, and at last asking permission to offer a sacrifice as an expression of his interest and regard (Philo, *Leg. Ad Caium*). The outcome, in fact, from all this attention to Agrippa — for the people accompanied him on his way to Cæsarea, strewing flowers in his path — was to be a blessing to the Jews of Asia Minor. Herod determined to accompany Agrippa on a campaign to the Bosphorus in the spring, but did not reach him until Agrippa arrived at Sinope in Pontus. With his usual munificence Herod marked his way by sumptuous gifts and also by friendly appeals to Agrippa for those in peculiar difficulties or needs. In Ionia the Jews came to complain of the utter disregard paid to their rights and privileges. Nicolas of Damascus pleaded their cause, and the injustice was stopped. With the blessing of the dispersion in Asia Minor, Herod returned to Jerusalem to receive the same expression of good-will from the people for this beneficent decision (*Ant. xvi. 2, 2-5*).

225. Meanwhile the troubles in the palace were fast becoming acute. Salome had contrived to shape her malignant falsehoods into the form of a plot on the part of the young princes to revenge their mother's death upon their father, by appealing to Augustus to look into the trial of Mariamme. Herod was enraged, and in the way of counter plot summoned to Jerusalem Antipater, his son by Doris, his first wife. In the blood of this young man was the poison of all his

father's worst passions. He was a veritable Iago. Mariamne had been instrumental in banishing him from Jerusalem and of course he was only too glad to join with Salome. He was able to give even to her valuable suggestions in the life-and-death game of court intrigue and deceit. Ostensibly he was a dear, faithful friend; really he was utterly false to both his brothers and his father. It was inconvenient for his plans that Herod insisted in commending him to Augustus and in finally sending him to Rome (Ant. xvi. 3, 1-3), but it was not fatal to them. He was compelled to intrigue at long range, but he worked with increasing effectiveness until finally Herod resolved to accuse Alexander and Aristobulus before Augustus in Rome. In the presence of the emperor, Herod spoke out of the misery of his heart, and Alexander with the straightforwardness of innocence. The penetrating insight of Augustus enabled him to appreciate the true situation. In a scene that moved all to tears, the old king was reconciled to his sons, and they all with Antipater returned to Judea. At a large gathering of the people in the temple, Herod declared that his sons were to reign after him, Antipater first, then Alexander and Aristobulus (Ant. xvi. 4, 1-4).

226. In his consummate hypocrisy, Antipater appeared overjoyed at the reconciliation; his real reason for rejoicing was that he was again within close reach of the means whereby to realize his nefarious ambitions. He began at once to plot against his brothers and Herod. The deepening troubles of the palace were interpreted by some as a judgment upon the impious king for searching the tomb of David for

treasure (Ant. xvi. 7, 2); but, despicable as that act was in the eyes of the Jews, it lay entirely outside of the complex of causes that were slowly shaping the destinies of Herod and his sons. Every member of the royal family became involved in the inextricable tangle of suspicion and treachery. Pheroras, Herod's brother, Salome, and Antipater were particularly eager to secure the downfall of the sons of Mariamne. Having carefully prepared Herod's mind by suspicion, they brought it about that the slaves of the young men were tortured. The wretched sufferers confessed what they were told to confess, and accused Alexander of conspiracy. Herod cast him into prison, and in the desperateness of his situation Alexander foolishly accepted the charge and incriminated all of Herod's relations except the clever hypocrite, Antipater. Black darkness settled down upon the spirit of the king, and another wholesale murder might have followed had not Archelaus, the king of Cappadocia, hastened to Judea to save his daughter, the wife of Alexander. By assuming an attitude of extreme anger toward Alexander and by threatening to take his daughter from the wretched court, Herod was actually led to plead in tears for his son. Archelaus then shifted the blame upon Pheroras, and before he set out for home managed to secure a reconciliation between even this man and Herod (Ant. xvi. 7-8).

227. Hardly had this storm blown over when a train of events led the hapless king into the disfavor of Augustus. A certain Syllæus, prime minister of the Arabian king Obodas II., was ambitious to put himself at the head of the kingdom. With the idea of strengthening himself by a helpful alliance, he had, on a visit

to Jerusalem, made love to Salome, who was old enough to be his mother. She, however, was willing to take the Arabian, and Herod gave his consent to the marriage provided Syllæus would submit to circumcision. This he absolutely refused to do, and went away determined to work mischief for Herod. His opportunity came in connection with a rebellion in Trachonitis, which was put down, indeed, but from the midst of which forty of the chief banditti leaders escaped to Arabia. Syllæus gave them protection while they plundered in Herod's dominions. As their numbers and boldness increased, Herod demanded from the Arabian king the delivery of the robbers. Syllæus refused and carried the matter to Rome. Herod, with the permission of Saturnius, invaded Arabia, captured the robber fortress of Rapita, and in order to keep the peace placed three thousand Idumeans in Trachonitis. The account of all this, given by Syllæus to Augustus, made Herod appear as a reckless disturber of the peace. Upon this point Augustus was very sensitive, and he at once reprimanded Herod in strong terms, telling him that he should henceforth be his subject, not his friend. The message brought Herod much anxiety and gave fresh stimulus to the disorders on the frontier. At length Nicolas of Damascus was sent to Rome to put the whole affair in its true character before Augustus. As the latter saw how false and malicious Syllæus had been, he wrote to Herod expressing repentance for the severe things he had said, and condemned Syllæus to death. Obodas II. had died, and Augustus would have added the Arabian kingdom to Herod's dominions had not a letter at this time from Judea suddenly changed his purpose. Be-

hind that letter lies another dark, painful history (Ant. xvi. 9, 1-4).

228. From the time of the bitter issue of the palace intrigues by which Alexander had been thrown into prison, complete distrust reigned in the court. Herod had confidence in nobody. Safety lay only in diverting suspicion from one's own person to that of another (Ant. xvi. 8, 2). Just at this time a Lacedæmonian, named Eurycles, appeared in Jerusalem and determined to use the tense conditions in the palace for his own gain. The man's cunning was matched only by his utter baseness. His method of operation was "to behave to everybody so as to appear to be his particular friend, and he made others believe that his associating with any one was for that person's advantage" (Ant. xvi. 10, 1). In this way he was clever enough to gain the confidences of Alexander, Antipater, and Herod, and in addition to secure a fine sum of money in the way of presents. By forged letters and invented deeds he made it indubitably appear that Alexander and Aristobulus were again seeking their father's death. The two were cast into prison. Salome begged Herod to kill them, and painful scenes attended the various examinations, but the king would not act until he had put the case before Augustus. The letter asking permission to put the young princes to death lost to Herod the territory of Arabia. Augustus advised the king to consider carefully what he was doing and to get the aid of a council of worthy advisers. This was called at Berytus and was made up, one half of Romans, the other of Jews. Herod himself was the accuser of his sons, and his conduct was that of a madman. Nevertheless the council gave him his desire, against

the noble protest of some of the Romans, and in the year 7 B. C. the two young men were strangled at Samaria. Only one voice was raised in protest against the awful crime, that of Teron, an old soldier-friend of Alexander's father, but he and three hundred others accused of sympathy with the princes were stoned to death by Herod's orders (Ant. xvi. 11, 1-7). With the death of these two rash but noble-minded young men, the race of worthy, admirable Hasmonians came to an end. In no succeeding representative of the line was there the power to kindle popular enthusiasm.

229. Once more the way seemed clear to quiet and security. Little did the old king realize, however, that swift Nemesis would soon hold up to scorn and horror the clever, all-powerful Antipater. Already the hatred of the nation was strong against him, for, despite his dissimulations, he was looked upon as the real murderer of his brothers. This, however, gave him slight uneasiness. His eyes were fixed upon the throne, and the sight of Herod yet occupying it incited his fiendish cunning to its utmost. He began his preparations for the final step to actual kingship by conciliating his father's friends by rich presents, and his masterful deception might have succeeded more quickly had not the lynx-eyed Salome seen through it and kept her brother informed. He in turn dared not act upon the information which Salome gave him because he knew too well her power to bear false, slandering witness (Ant. xvii. 1, 1).

230. Among the real facts she had to tell Herod was the promise the Pharisees had made to Pheroras that the Judean crown should be taken from Herod and given to him, and that a eunuch named Bagoas

should raise up a son to the childless Pheroras in accordance with the word of Isaiah (lvi. 3). "Let not the eunuch say I am a dry tree." All of this had Messianic bearing; indeed, the rumors of a coming Messiah were now undoubtedly repeated to Herod. Prophecies of this kind he both feared and hated, and the Pharisees who were trying thus to give them circulation were promptly put to death. Herod asked Pheroras to put his wife away, for she was intimately concerned in this affair, but he would not, and retired with her to his tetrarchy in Perea. Antipater was forbidden to have anything to do with them. This command he respected only by trying to avoid discovery. The fear of the growing suspicion of his father led him to ask to be sent to Rome. Herod gladly gave him permission to go, and sent with him to Augustus the will in which he was named as the successor to the throne. In Rome he continued his plottings, but events meanwhile were taking place at home by which the eyes of Herod were opened to the black villany of his long course of treachery. The death of Pheroras awakened suspicion, and upon investigation it was found to be the result of poison given by his wife. She confessed also to having received poison from Antipater to kill Herod. While the investigation was in progress, Bathyllus, Antipater's freedman, arrived from Rome. He had in his keeping not only letters concocted to defame Archelaus and Philip, his brothers, but also another dose of poison for Herod (Ant. xvii. 2, 4; 3, 1-2; 4, 1-3).

231. Masking his rage, the king sent Antipater a friendly letter asking him to come home. Antipater had not heard a word about the revelations that fol-

lowed the death of Pheroras. Not a man had been willing to warn him, and he had no suspicion of danger until he reached Cæsarea and found no one to greet him. It was impossible now to turn back, and he rode on in sullen silence to Jerusalem. His reception at the palace foretold unmistakably his fate. He tried to salute Herod, who replied: "God confound you, you vile wretch! Do not touch me till you have cleared yourself of these crimes that are charged upon you!" (J. W. i. 31, 5). In the trial that followed, Herod's review of the man's base return for his affection was indeed pathetic. The young man himself made a wonderful appeal for his life. The proof of his guilt, however, was overwhelming, and he was cast into prison to await the word of Augustus. This came soon after, and five days before Herod himself died the miserable man was put to death and "ignobly buried in the Hyrcanium" (Ant. xvii. 5, 1-8; 7, 1).

232. Herod was now an old man of seventy. His long life had been full of resolute activity, and for years he had had little relief from the terrible tension of suspicion and fear. His iron constitution broke at last. Nothing since the death of Mariamne had so struck at the very centre of life within him as the exposure of Antipater. Its own revelation of treachery, and the torturing questions which it put in reference to the death of the sons of Mariamne, were too much for the weakened, suffering old man. He sank under a complication of disorders, physical and mental. His sickness itself inspired horror. The news of it sent a thrill of joy through the city, and measures were at once taken to remove the hated objects of his heathen profanations. The golden eagle was the first to come

down, and then such images as were found elsewhere in the city. The haste, however, was ill-timed. As a fire that seems to have died out leaps unexpectedly into a destructive flame, so the fury of Herod burst forth once more at the tidings of the zeal of the rabbis and their scholars, and they paid for their rashness with their lives (Ant. xvii. 6, 1-4).

233. Death was now looking him in the face. He had tried in vain the baths of Callirrhoe. His physicians could do no more for him. The utter desolation of his soul maddened him. He sent for Salome and bade her summon all the principal men of the nation, shut them up in the hippodrome, and at the announcement of his death massacre them, so that there should be mourning at his funeral. The great company was imprisoned within the hippodrome, but was not massacred. Salome released them, and Herod was unmourned. The splendid funeral, with its bier of gold, its odor of burning spices and sweet incense, its military display, and all its regal pomp had in it not one touch of sorrow.

234. "In the days of Herod the King," in a quiet Judean village, a babe was born whose coming gave to Herod's reign its deepest interest for all time. Word was first brought to him of the singular character of this unknown child by the inquiries of wise men from the East. That question, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" started afresh the anxious fears which every Messianic prophecy or hope caused Herod. An enrollment, required by Augustus and carried out in accordance with Jewish custom, had taken Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem. When Herod learned that prophecy pointed to this very town as the

birthplace of the Messiah (Matt. ii. 4-6), his fears gave speed to the execution of his plan to insure the death of the unwelcome child by a general slaughter of the children of Bethlehem. How the deed failed of its purpose; how the kingdom of the child-king slowly widened beyond the dominions of Herod and of Augustus, — is a matter of record not simply in the history of the Jews, but in the history of the world. Like many another embodiment of the hatred and determination of evil, Herod by "the slaughter of the innocents" sought to stay the saving purpose of God. His pitiable impotence was and ever will be a striking illustration of the utter futility of any earthly power which seeks to do what he did that dark day in Bethlehem.

VII

THE INNER LIFE OF THE NATION

235. THE complex interests and external brilliancy of Herod's long reign engage naturally the complete attention of the historian. Augustus and the Roman officials, Herod and his court, the high-priest and the Jewish nobles, the Greeks and their Hellenistic cities, are all factors in a problem whose outworking in the days of the Idumean king was of absorbing interest. An interest yet deeper, however, centres in the life of the people, for that life, inspired by stern ambitions and quickened by large hopes, was also working out issues of earnest import. Except when in moments of indignation a righteous spirit flamed forth against the heathenish deeds of Herod, the nation's life moved quietly and with the monotony of every-day routine. It was a still, strong current revealing its depth and power only against the obstacles that were at times thrown defiantly in its way. These times of opposition are, therefore, of more than passing interest. They are indices, exponents, of that inward development which is, after all, the essential part of a nation's history. As the critical moments of antagonism measure the force of a nation's inner life, so the institutions which are dear to it reveal the quality of that life and the literature which comes out of it, its trend or direction. Power, quality, direction, — these are the char-

acteristics the knowledge of which enables one to speak of the inner life of a nation.

236. Already many illustrations of the first characteristic have been before us. The cheering crowd that nerved the daring despoilers of the golden eagle on the temple; the silent multitude which received in distrust and fear Herod's proposals to build a new temple; the abiding hatred which all his achievements could not overcome, — these speak of the intensity of that life which was unalterably opposed to the foreign influences embodied and promoted by Herod. The whole Maccabean period itself was a revelation of it.

237. The institutions in which such life was nourished and developed were the home, the synagogue, the school, and the temple. All had one common central object of interest and devotion, — the law. All sought to transmute into the fibre and sinew of character the precepts derived from its pages. By them all the way of its requirements was considered the way of life. Hence began in the earliest and most impressible years of childhood that instruction which was to instil into the little mind love and reverence for the religion of his people. Their history, full of the care and guidance of God, of the brave and noble deeds of heroes and prophets, and of events of deep religious significance, was opened to him. He was taught to repeat verses from the law, benedictions, and wise sayings, and at a very early age began to learn to read. "We devote," says Josephus, "the greatest pains to the education of children, and make the observance of the law and the rules of piety which have been given us the most important of our lives" (Against Apion i. 12). Judaism thus laid its founda-

tions securely in the mind of childhood. Her children were to grow up in the "nurture and admonition" of the law. Her spirit was to move the tender, sensitive, responsive spirits of the little ones. By birth they were partakers of the covenant; by training they must learn the way to the largest realization of that covenant's blessings. The home life was in an atmosphere of piety. With the first awakening consciousness of the child began those impressions of the religious interests of father and mother which prepared the way for the teaching of the law and all along enforced its precepts.

238. There is no good reason for rejecting the tradition regarding Simon ben Shetach's endeavor to establish schools for young children (see sect. 132), although it is probable that elementary schools did not exist in any large number until considerably later than the time of Christ. The establishment of them in every province and town is attributed to Jesus, the son of Gamaliel (63-65 A. D.). When such a school existed, it was in connection with the synagogue. For the great mass of Jewish boys there was no further direct, personal instruction than that which was given at home, or in one of the elementary schools, if such existed before Christ's time. All higher education in the way of schools was only for those who were destined to be students of the law. This does not mean, however, in the case of those who worked in the fields, or at their trades, that the impressions of childhood were left to grow dim and finally fade away. On the contrary, the developing lad was, as the years went on, brought more and more into inevitable obligation to the observances of the law, and at the first

appearance of the signs of manhood he entered upon his full service.

239. Meanwhile instruction came to him through the instrumentality of that distinctive institution of post-exilic Judaism, — the synagogue. This was the true school of the nation. The primary purpose of the synagogue was not devotion, but instruction. Whether the origin of the institution be traceable to the exile, or to the time of Ezra, it became the most telling factor in the development of that Judaism which was ready to suffer, and to war, if need be, for the law. It gathered the people of the whole land together into its assemblies on the Sabbath and on feast days in order to expound to them the scriptures. By that exposition it made its frequenters familiar with the lofty moral elements in the law and with the exalted spiritual ideals of the prophets. It is true that the expositions of the scribes, who found a fine scope for their ability in the synagogue, were often marred by the refinements of casuistry, or by the perversions of allegorical explanation, but there were also the interpretation of real insight and the inspiration of noble vision.

240. The synagogue was the social religious centre of the town. In communities preponderatingly Jewish, the local council of elders possessed both civil and ecclesiastical authority; they exercised control in the affairs of the synagogue. One of their number was generally the ruler of the synagogue, and it was his duty to appoint readers and preachers for the services. The "minister" was the official who kept the building and the paraphernalia in order, and attended to the scripture rolls for reading; he also had charge

of the execution of the sentence of scourging whenever pronounced by the synagogue. The order of service in the time of Christ and for some time before his coming was comparatively simple. It began with the recitation by a leader of a sort of confession of faith (Deut. vi. 4-9; xi. 13-21; Numbers xv. 37-41). The congregation meanwhile stood with their faces toward the Holy of Holies at Jerusalem and responded at intervals with an "amen." Then came the lesson from the law, the reading of which was distributed among seven men, each taking at least three verses and waiting after each verse for its translation from Hebrew into Aramaic, the language of the people, by a special interpreter. A brief prayer of thanksgiving preceded and followed each section of the reading. After the law, thus read, followed a lesson from the prophets, which was freely interpreted or even paraphrased and made the basis for the discourse of the day. The exercises closed with a benediction which took the form of a prayer if no priest was present to pronounce it as a benediction.

241. This plain service, with its emphasis upon instruction, afforded the people constant contact with the results, methods, aims, and spirit of one of the most potent forces in the life of the nation. It was possible for any suitable person who felt that he had a message to step forward and address the audience, as Jesus did in the synagogue at Nazareth, but usually and naturally this duty devolved upon those who were fitted for it, and they were the scribes. The synagogue was to them an open door of opportunity through which to reach the nation and to bring to it the fruits of years of devotion to the study of the law. "Lovely was it,"

reads the Targum on Judges v. 9, describing in reality the rabbis of Herodian times, "as they sat in the synagogues and taught the people the words of the law, when they pronounced the blessing and professed the truth before God. Their own business did they make of no less account, and rode upon asses through the whole land, and sat upon the seat of judgment."

242. The name "scribe" applied originally to those who made copies of the law, but it soon acquired a wider significance, since care for the text involved a study of it and often comment upon it. Whatever the position and influence of the scribes before and during the exile, the policy of Ezra (Ezra vii. 10), who himself was more a scribe than a priest, gave a new impulse to the service to which they had been accustomed. The men who sought to realize his ideal of seeking the law of the Lord, of doing it, and of "teaching in Israel statutes and judgments," found their time fully occupied. They could not make this earnest work secondary. "The wisdom of the scribe cometh by opportunity of leisure," says the Son of Sirach (xxxviii. 24), and that opportunity was gained in making their labor an independent profession. By the beginning of the Greek period they had formed themselves into a guild of biblical scholars, and by their diligence and zeal gradually took from the priests the guardianship of the law. Nor was it only in mere theoretical interests that their work was carried on. Life in all its reach and complexity must ultimately be covered by the commands and requirements of the law, and the solemnity of the relationship of life and law lay in a strong faith in divine retribution. Duty was thus pressed home upon the conscience. The highest welfare of the individual, as

well as of the nation, was in obedience, — an obedience, however, whose interpretation was not satisfied in a free response to a great principle of action, but in that demand for attention to the details of duty which finally, by a multiplicity of rules, shut the principle away from sight. Hence the threefold task of the scribes, — to expand the law, to teach it, and to administer it.

X 243. It was the complexity of life that compelled the expansion of the law. No written law can meet all the exigencies of experience nor even the details of commonplace routine; but question after question sprang up from just these sources, and in the effort to answer the questions accumulated slowly the mass of oral traditions which came ultimately to have the value of the law itself. It was in the higher schools, notably in those found in Jerusalem, that the discussions were carried on which resulted in the establishment of such interpretative additions to the law itself as met the needs of experience and at the same time put a “hedge about the law;” that is, kept its force inviolate. It was to the schools that boys of promise were sent to be fitted for the honorable position of the rabbi. It was from these schools that the teachers in the synagogue came to give to the people the benefit of their learning and to quicken fidelity. The two readings in the service of a Sabbath morning gave opportunity for the expression of the twofold wisdom of the scribes. Their comment upon the Pentateuchal law was in the form of legal precept and was called by them “Halacha,” or binding rule; their discourses upon the prophets, in which imagination had fair play, often in the form of parable or legend, were described as “Haggada,” or

edifying comment. One form of teaching was explicit, regulative, and authoritative; the other was imaginative, mystical, often transcendental. One defined duty; the other often merely satisfied curiosity. One aimed to bring this life completely under the domain of law; the other, upon the wings of speculation, entered the realm of angels, or of evil spirits, or into that happy future time when the Messiah should come.

244. A good specimen of the manner in which hag-gadistic tradition sought thus to satisfy a useless curiosity is found in the Book of Jubilees, — a work full of stories and fables regarding the patriarchs and intent upon showing that the law existed from eternity, and was observed by the angels in all its directions concerning festivals and ceremonies. Entertaining as all this was, it was nevertheless in the Halacha that the spirit of Judaism attained its completest expression. Under the pleasing delusion of honoring God's will was developed a system of exactions and restrictions which gratified intellectual pride and at the same time offered a detailed program for a holy life. Two themes especially were the subject of repeated discussion and definition, and they are good examples of the aim and method of this whole line of tradition. These were the sanctity of the Sabbath and the requirements concerning both cleanness and uncleanness. In the Mishna, which is the collection of the oral traditions made at the end of the second century A. D., there are thirty-nine kinds of work expressly prohibited on the Sabbath, each of which, by casuistical application, was made to include other works fancifully allied to that in the main prohibition. The day was made a burdensome, wearying complex of duties, both positive and negative.

In the same spirit was developed the tiresome explicitness regarding ceremonial purity and purification. No less than twelve treatises in the Mishna are devoted to the subject. There was, indeed, practically no end to the possible ramifications of scribal casuistry. It *was* an astonishing thing when Jesus, in reverent originality and calm, passionless independence, put away tradition, and with an "I say unto you," went back to what has been called "the mother speech of all religion."

245. Scribism was in full power when his fresh, heaven-sent message was heard in Galilee and Judea. The traditions were at that time only orally transmitted. The marks, therefore, of successful pupils in the schools were a good memory and scrupulous care to add nothing to what was taught them. The highest compliment a scholar could receive was to be compared to a cemented well which loses not a drop of water (Sayings of the Fathers, ii. 8). Repetition was the soul of knowledge. "It hath been said" was the watchword of attention. Religious life was loaded down with the oppressive weight of these punctiliously repeated additions. Even the Mishna was itself furnished with a commentary called the Gemara, until at last in comment upon comment the basal precept was often beyond recognition.

246. As life was thus in every detail of it lifted into the sphere of a religious legalism, the administrative function of the scribe became an inevitable consequence. Who could so well determine what was right, that is, what was legal, as he? He was by his very position a jurist. It is, therefore, but natural that scribes should have place and power in the Sanhedrin. In this highest court of the nation they

figured with imposing efficiency. In their several capacities of teachers, preachers, and judges, they thus became the guides of the nation. They were the strength of the Pharisees, to which party nearly all of them belonged, and with all the urgency of a zeal to save the nation by a carefully prescribed righteousness, they seconded all endeavors to make religious rather than political ideals the goal of the nation's striving.

247. Our New Testament is witness to the honor which they received among the people (Matt. xxiii. 6, 7), and the Mishna defines clearly their right to receive it. According to its teachings, the rabbis were the lamp and shield bearers of Israel, the princes of the people and the fathers of the world; a rabbi was worthy of the same reverence as God himself (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 125). The consequences of such claims as these are all too clearly seen in the pride and arrogance which sought out the foremost places in the synagogues and received with self-flattering satisfaction the reverential greetings of men in the market-place (Matt. xxiii. 6-7). All of the scribes, however, were not of this character. Among them were men of the noblest type; men who with all their learning and influence lived humble, God-fearing lives. Such was Hillel, a contemporary of Herod, about whose name many mythical stories have gathered, and who said, "What you would not have done to you do not to others." Such were Gamaliel and Simon, his son. Their exceptional character is the more striking in the fact that they lived in the days when the legitimate results of the methods and aims of scribism were sadly evident in both the schools and the nation.

248. It has with truth been said that "the early scribes were not the enslavers of the people, but instead consecrated, zealous, efficient teachers who by their faithful instruction pointed out to the masses the way of righteousness and gave to the forms of worship a meaning which they had never before possessed" (Kent, vol. iii. sect. 238). Time and method changed all this. Instead of deepening and enriching religious life, all this zeal for the law brought about a pitiable externalization of it. Free moral action in the light of great principles was exchanged for an outward, rule-defined constraint which became more and more burdensome. Trivial duties were placed upon the same level with those of an exalted character. The result was an entire lack of moral perspective. The quality of an act was simply in its conformity or non-conformity to a given requirement. "Moral duty was split up into an endless atomistic multitude of separate duties and obligations." The process insured the slow, sure death of all joyous moral freedom. Nowhere in the Gospels are sterner words to be found than in those with which Jesus addressed these misleading teachers. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" is the terrible refrain of the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, and that chapter is a startling summary of what these learned doctors had done and were doing for Judaism in Palestine during the days of the Maccabean and the Roman supremacy.

249. It has been said that the synagogue was the rival of the temple. If so, the rivalry was entirely unconscious. It was expressed in the strength of the hold of the synagogue upon the Jews both in Palestine and in the dispersion rather than in any

voice exalting one institution at the expense of the other. No voice, indeed, could be loyal to the law and at the same time depreciate in the slightest the great central shrine of the nation's faith. Hence it happened that while the scribes were often quite out of sympathy with the higher caste of the priesthood, they elaborated with their customary care the precepts regarding the sanctuary. Nor was it simply in the multiplied requirements of the scribal traditions that the temple's honor and service were faithfully guarded. Its daily offerings were a relief to burdened hearts wherever the expanded law by its pressure upon conscience had quickened the sense of sin. And even where the sacrificial offering was the climacteric expression of punctilious formal observances, the visible means of approach to God, of the atonement for sin, and of the renewal of a holy covenant were looked upon as a necessity. This is shown in the fact that private offerings and sacrifices far outnumbered those that were public. All day long the priests were busy with these offerings, — witnesses of the effort to secure the favor of God. There is no contradiction between this fidelity and the externalization of religious life. The fidelity was on the line of the formalism, and imposing as the ritual of the temple was, it was, even before the days of the Saviour, an elaborate complex of services which expressed in highest forms the satisfaction of legal requirement. That there was in it no reality at all would be a statement wide of the truth. There were faithful priests and earnest worshippers, but beside the altar and within the sacred courts were influences at work which were undermining the vital import of the sacrifices. The higher ranks of the

priesthood and the scribes were both in different ways and with different aims helping on this same issue.

250. Despite the formal equality of the whole body of priests there were formed about given families from whom high officials had been taken, or who by especial circumstances had secured marked favors, certain coteries which claimed superiority and which were responsive to all the worldly influences about them. The emoluments of their office brought them wealth and luxury, and gave them little interest in the spiritual demands of their exalted position. These priests were Sadducean in their political attitude and had awakened the distrust of the nation. Indeed, from the time that the office of high-priest had been at the disposal of the civil ruler, the glory of the priesthood had been shadowed. Add to this the fact that the great body of the ordinary priests aspired to no knowledge beyond the routine of the temple service, and it is not difficult to understand how the doctors of the law gradually supplanted them in influence and authority. Here there were two forces which were, each in its own way, devitalizing the worship of the Holy place; one by a mere professional attention to sacred duties, the other by an externalization of duty itself. And yet the temple was thronged at the great festivals, and each day from the moment when the rays of the rising sun first fell upon Hebron, and the cry was made, "it is day at Hebron," the courts of the Holy place were alive with the varied interests of religious praise and devotion. Nor did that devotion cease till the altar and the Holy of Holies were cast down in hopeless ruin by the Ro-

mans. The priests themselves grew more arrogant and worldly-minded (Ant. xx. 9, 2); the scribes kept adding to the traditions, and yet the life of the nation tightened its hold upon the law.

251. Why it all was so must be answered in our consideration of the determining motives of Judaism, and for that we must turn to the literature which expressed the hopes and the dreams of the nation. These centre about that all-important figure of later Judaism,—the Messiah. He was to come because the people had been faithful. And then, too, he was to come to make the nation glorious,—a faithful nation made supreme and immortal by a triumphing Messiah; under the glory of that hope the scribes might divide the law till its minute exactions left nothing out, and the people would attend if only their hope might have fruition. "If Israel could keep only two Sabbaths as they should be kept, redemption would come at once," was the word of one of the rabbis, and it expresses what is said once and again in the Mishna, that Israel's redemption was dependent upon her repentance and fulfilment of the law. Amid the dark days of foreign interference and oppression, the hope brightened and enlarged till its scope was commensurate with the world.

252. The earliest unquestioned reference to the Messiah in Apocalyptic literature is found in the second part of the Book of Enoch (lxxxiii.-xc.), written between 166-161 B. C., and it gives us simply the association of his name with the great changes which God himself was to bring about. The Messiah was to appear after the adversaries of the righteous had been destroyed, and God had set up the New Jerusalem. In

the fourth part of the same work (xxxvii.-lxx.), which dates from the first half of the first century B. C., the Messiah is represented as a supernatural being, and in conceptions corresponding with that concerning his origin are set forth his universal dominion and the blessedness of those who shall dwell with him in righteousness and peace. With the same exalted tone the Psalms of Solomon (Psalms xvii.-xviii.) tell of a righteous king, pure from sin, who shall gather together the dispersed of Israel, banish the unbelieving Gentile from the nation, destroy the ungodly and establish such a glorious reign that from the ends of the earth men shall come to see it.

253. On down through the first century the Messianic hope held before the hearts of the faithful the vision of rest and joy. Jesus came and preached and died. The nation saw no hope in him. The Book of Jubilees can tell of only the old, weary way to the longed-for glory. A time of bitterness and sorrow shall quicken the hearts of all to do "all his commandments and his ordinances and all his laws, without departing either to the right hand or to the left." Then slowly, surely the days of rejoicing will come, all enemies shall be destroyed and the days shall all be days of blessing. In the same way the Assumption of Moses (7-29 A. D.) conditions the coming of the Messianic kingdom upon the nation's repentance, and promises, for the happy time which that repentance shall usher in, the destruction of Israel's enemies and her exaltation even to heaven.


254. Nor was the voice of cheer and hope heard only in Palestine where the hated Roman and his despised vassals—the Herods—made more intense

the desire for deliverance. Judaism in Alexandria was dreaming and prophesying about the same happy time. In a form consonant with its general character the Book of Wisdom expects a Messianic kingdom (iii. 7, 8), and that kingdom is the ultimate blessing in the Sibyl's prophetic vision of the future (iii. 652-794). Even Philo, whose deepest interest was in the philosophic interpretation of his faith, looked forward to a consummation in the nation's history when the despised should gather from all parts of the earth to the Holy Land and there enjoy immeasurable blessings, material as well as spiritual (*De Execat.* sect. 8, 9; *De Prem. et Poem.* sect. 15-20).

255. About this hope also clustered a group of teachings which intensified its charm. Jerusalem should be renovated and become the centre of the world-wide kingdom of the Messiah. Death should give up every righteous soul that had entered its shadowy dominions. In the reconstructed nation righteousness and peace should make possible all earthly blessings.

256. At the same time that Jesus walked with ruthless feet through the tangled meshes of scribal sophistry and taught the way of the true fulfilment of the law, he watched with earnest care lest that magic word "Messiah" should fall in public from his lips. The quivering expectation of the hour he dared not answer in a word, and his own heart must have been sad indeed, when in that moment of entry into Jerusalem amid the loud hosannas, he realized that he could not, must not, satisfy the nation's dreams. Thus, then, Judaism lived out its inner life. Upon its stern severity fell the genial light of Hellenism, attracting

some toward the sunnier life. Others held the happy medium which took the best from the nation's gift and from the great world outside. Others still in whose hearts the Spirit worked his will, kept the "inner law divine," but the great mass of the people, the nation as a whole, toiled under the burden of the law and cheered their weary way by hopes of blessed days to come, which hope grew intenser with the years.



VIII

HEROD'S SONS AND KING AGRIPPA

257. IMMEDIATELY after the public announcement of Herod's death his last will was read to a large gathering of soldiers and people in the amphitheatre at Jericho. By its provisions, which could not go into effect until approved by Augustus, Archelaus, a son by Malthace, was to receive the royal title with Judea, Samaria, and Idumea; Herod Antipas, brother of Archelaus, as tetrarch, was to govern Galilee and Perea, while Philip, a son by Cleopatra of Jerusalem, was to rule, also as tetrarch, over the northeastern districts of Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulanitis, Paneas, and Iturea. Salome, the sister of Herod, was remembered by the gift of Jamnia and Ashdod on the coast and Phasaëlis in the Jordan valley. It was quite contrary to Herod's original intention to break up in this way the large kingdom which his genius had established (see J. W. i. 30, 7), and his final will has been justly estimated as a compromise between the various intrigues of the palace (Hausrath). Whether this estimate be true or not, the will committed the different sections of the kingdom to different policies and issues, determined in each case by the character of the man in supreme command.

258. Judea soon discovered that she had little to expect from a change of masters. She was still in the

grasp of a Herod whose methods and ambitions were in line with those of his father. Friction began at once. From a golden throne ostentatiously set up in the temple-enclosure Archelaus made to the people fine promises and pretensions regarding his government. These were immediately brought to test by demands made for a reduction of taxes and customs, for the release of prisoners, for the punishment of those who had counselled the death of the despoilers of the Roman eagle, for the deposition of the high-priest Josar, and for the expulsion of the Gentiles. The young ruler was in a close place. He did not wish to provoke an outbreak before his confirmation in authority by Augustus; neither had he a mind to follow out any such rigorous line of action as these demands required. The people would not listen to delay and the situation became acute. It was the time for the Passover and the gathering crowds in Jerusalem made the position of Archelaus hourly more dangerous. He learned the mood of the people from the rough treatment which a detachment of soldiers, sent to keep order, received at their hands, and forthwith his whole fighting force was called out to quell the growing tumult. Three thousand of the Jews fell in the fierce fight which took place in the streets and temple, and orders were given that all visitors to the feast should return home (Ant. xvii. 9, 1-3).

259. Leaving behind him intense and bitter feeling, Archelaus set off for Rome. At Cæsarea he met Sabinus, the emperor's administrator in Syrian affairs, who was on his way to Judea to take charge of Herod's matters until a successor should be appointed. This man proved only an exasperation to the already excited

people. Before his arrival in Jerusalem, the contagion of rebellion had spread over the whole land, and Varus, the governor of Syria, had brought down his legions from Antioch to overawe the people. One of these legions was left at Jerusalem to support Sabinus, who, in reckless greed, used it to oppress the people and to enrich himself. As a consequence the feast of Pentecost was made a time of war rather than of thanksgiving, and a desperate effort was made to utterly destroy the Romans. Against the most stubborn resistance the latter fought their way to the temple-courts and robbed the treasury, Sabinus himself carrying off four hundred talents (Ant. xvii. 10, 1-2).

260. Once more the spirit of revolt flew swiftly over the land. In Galilee, Judas put himself at the head of a large force, seized the arsenal at Sepphoris and made himself a terror in the northern province. Simon, a former slave of Herod, proclaimed himself king, and besides other works of destruction, looted the royal palace at Jericho. Athronges, a certain shepherd and leader of a band of robbers, took advantage of the restless, rebellious spirit in the country, to place upon his head a royal crown, and to inspire terror in Judea. Only one common purpose animated these and all other uprisings of the time, and that was to drive out the hated Romans. Varus, as soon as he heard of the general condition in the land, hastened southward collecting auxiliary troops on the way, and, by the sharpest measures, among which was the crucifixion of two thousand of the rebels, put down the rebellion (Ant. xvii. 10, 4-10).

261. Meanwhile, in Rome, Archelaus, Antipas, Philip, and a deputation from the Jews were urging

their wishes upon Augustus. Not realizing what their petition might mean to them, the Jewish ambassadors urged the emperor to place the country under the direct control of a Roman governor. In a notable assembly in the temple of Apollo a conference was held and each claimant allowed to present his case. The Jews spoke earnestly and well, but their grave charges were met by the skilful rebuttal of Nicolas of Damascus, who spoke for his master Archelaus. Augustus finally adhered to the provisions of Herod's last will with the exception of making Archelaus ethnarch instead of king, and of reserving Gaza, Gadara, and Hippos as parts of the province of Syria (Ant. xvii. 11, 1-5).

262. A sad condition of affairs faced Antipas and Archelaus as they came back to their respective provinces. In Galilee and Judea alike were the ruins of many desolated villages, and thousands of lives had paid the penalty of rebellion. No welcome from the people awaited these rulers and each set about the furtherance of his own policy in his own way. The history of the land now becomes the history of three separate provinces.

263. Archelaus proved to be in the completest sense the son of his father. He was the worst of all the sons and his short reign was summed up to the emperor as "barbarous and tyrannical." They endured its recklessness for nine years and then made such an effectual showing of its desperate character to Augustus that in 6 A. D. he banished the man to Vienne in Gaul and annexed his dominions to the province of Syria. It is noteworthy that the delegation which journeyed to Rome to petition for his removal was

made up of both Jews and Samaritans. Archelaus went to no such extremes as his father in rash violations of the religious sensibilities of the Jews, although his marriage with Galphrya gave great offence. She had once been the wife of Alexander, his half-brother, and several children were the fruit of that marriage. This fact made her union with Archelaus grossly illegal. It was, however, his violent and arbitrary character that kept Archelaus constantly in trouble, and his useful and beautiful public works, such as the cultivation of palm-groves in the Jordan valley, the construction of an aqueduct to supply them with water, and the founding of a new city, Archelais, north of Jericho, could not atone for his own worthlessness. He was from the first a wretched failure (Ant. xvii. 13, 1-5).

†264. A brighter picture presents itself in the history of the province of Herod Antipas. The man himself was cunning, extravagant, and self-seeking. Jesus referred to him as "that fox" (Luke xiii. 32), and such vicious qualities as had come to him by heredity were doubtless strengthened by his early life in Rome. He was no favorite with Augustus, who understood his treacherous nature, but it would seem as if this very characteristic commended him to Tiberius, who was his firm friend and supporter. By proper prudence and caution he maintained a peaceful status in Galilee and thus avoided any complaint on the part of his subjects during the lifetime of Augustus. When Tiberius came to the throne in 14 A. D., Antipas basked in the sunshine of royal favor. The price of such favor, however, was the Idumean's willingness to play the spy in reference to various Roman officials in the East (Ant. xviii. 4, 5).

265. Of all the sons of Herod, Antipas inherited, to the largest degree, his father's fondness for magnificence, both in private life and in public buildings. His royal palace at Tiberias was an example of the sumptuous surroundings by which he gratified his extravagant tastes, and the city of Tiberias itself was but one of the public constructions which made his reign famous. At his bidding Sepphoris arose again from its ashes and for a considerable time was the capital and, as Josephus describes it, "the ornament of all Galilee." He rebuilt the old town of Beth-Haram in southern Perea, and in honor of the wife of Augustus called it Livias. He also enlarged and made palatial the old fortress of Machærus on the heights east of the Dead Sea. It was with the twofold design of satisfying his own ambitions in having a splendid capital, and of gratifying the emperor, that, in the year 26 or 27 A. D., he built the city of Tiberias near the hot springs of Emmaus on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. No expense was spared to make the city worthy of its purpose; but the discovery of the site of an old burial-ground during the laying of foundations made the place for some time unclean to the Jews. Herod was therefore compelled to colonize it with a very mixed population, and as a result this new city in Galilee became another Hellenizing centre. Its government was Hellenistic in form and several of its public buildings were in the interest of the Greek spirit (*Ant.* xviii. 2, 3; *J. W.* ii. 21, 6, 9).

266. Antipas was at heart a pagan. His conformity to Judaism was only formal. He lived for his own personal ambitions, but was shrewd enough to keep general public interests in line with his private desires.

Still, even shrewdness will not always save a man from himself, and all the customary astuteness of this successful tetrarch did not at last avail against his ungovernable passions. The evidence of this is furnished in a visit which he made to Rome in 27 A. D. Here he was entertained at the home of his half-brother Herod (Boethus), whose wife was Herodias. Antipas was fascinated with this woman's charms and shamefully proposed marriage. Herodias, a descendant of the beautiful Mariamne, was an ambitious woman and was willing enough to leave her inconspicuous home in Rome for the palace in Tiberias. Antipas, therefore, made arrangements to divorce his wife, the daughter of Aretas, and take Herodias in her place. Passion triumphed over every dictate of prudence, and serious trouble at once began. Aretas was made an enemy, and in the outspoken judgments of John the Baptist's faithful preaching, Antipas was held up to the contempt and scorn of Galilee. For this work of condemnation Herodias never forgave John, who paid for his fidelity with his life at a bacchanalian festival celebrated in the palace-fortress of Machærus (Mark vi. 17-29). The tetrarch had imprisoned the Baptist out of fear of a public uprising as the result of his preaching (Ant. xviii. 5, 2). When once the fearless prophet was within prison walls, Herodias awaited her opportunity to compass his death, and the brief account given us in the gospels make only too clear the fatal weakness of Herod.

267. Not long after this disgraceful scene at Machærus came the time of reckoning with Aretas. The existing enmity had been deepened by quarrels over boundary lines, and in the war which broke out in

36 A. D. Antipas was disastrously defeated (Ant. xviii. 5, 1). It is not surprising that the defeat was interpreted by the people as God's judgment upon the murder of John (Ant. xviii. 5, 2). The conscience of the tetrarch was itself sensitive. Its superstitious fear made Jesus to be John the Baptist risen from the dead (Matt. xiv. 1). It is also noticeable how careful Herod was to avoid a second deed of violence. He used the Pharisees to persuade Jesus to leave his dominions (Luke xiii. 1), and finally at the feast in Jerusalem he refused to pronounce the death sentence upon the Galilean prisoner whom Pilate sent to him (Luke xxiii. 6-11).

268. As soon as tidings reached Tiberius of the success of Aretas, Vitellius was ordered to avenge the disaster of Antipas. In the midst of the preparations for the execution of this command Tiberius died, March 16, 37 A. D. Vitellius, who had suffered from the espionage of Antipas, then refused to carry out the orders of the dead emperor. Herod was in a critical position. Once more Herodias proved to be his evil genius. Caligula, the new emperor, was a warm friend of Agrippa I., the brother of Herodias, and advanced him to kingship over the territories formerly in possession of Philip (Ant. xviii. 6, 10). Herodias was jealous of this honor and urged her husband to go to Rome and plead for the name of king. Against his own inclinations Herod set out for Italy. He never saw Galilee again, for Agrippa, by a messenger, anticipated his arrival in Rome and laid charges before Caligula of the tetrarch's disloyalty. The fact, which Antipas was obliged to admit, that in the arsenals of Galilee was a stock of arms sufficient to equip seventy

thousand men, was adjudged conclusive and Antipas was banished in 39 A. D. to Lyons in Gaul. His territory was immediately added to the kingdom of Agrippa (Ant. xviii. 7, 1, 2).

269. The least promising of all the provinces distributed by the will of Herod the king was that which was given to Philip. While it was large in extent, it was poor and inhabited by a mixed population of Arabs and Syrians, among whom had settled Idumean colonists. Philip, however, was the man for the place. In striking contrast with all the other sons of Herod, he exhibited a disposition and purpose which made his rulership a blessing. He made the interests of his people his own and was satisfied to do the best he could for their welfare. An instance of this is given by Josephus, who relates that he was accustomed to go about with a small retinue of chosen friends, and that "his tribunal also on which he sat in judgment, followed him in his progress; and when any one met him who wanted his assistance, he made no delay, but had his tribunal set down immediately wherever he happened to be, and sat upon it and heard the complaint; he then ordered the guilty who were convicted to be punished, and absolved those who were accused unjustly" (Ant. xviii. 4, 6). For thirty-seven years he thus ruled, and it is no small tribute to his character and administration that where Roman generals had extreme difficulty in maintaining order, he kept peace and good-will. It is a fine instance of the superiority of kindness and justice to force in the management of a supposably intractable people. Philip was really a Gentile in spirit. He was the first Jewish prince who used images on his coins, but because his tetrarchy was

so largely pagan in feeling, it gave no offence. He made his capital at Paneas, near one of the sources of the Jordan, and the beautiful city which he erected and made an asylum for all in need of protection, he called Cæsarea Philippi. He also enlarged the village of Bethsaida on the northeastern shore of the Sea of Galilee and gave it the name of Julias, for Julia, the profligate daughter of Augustus. His wife, Salome, the daughter of Herodias, bound him in friendly relations to the court of Antipas in Galilee. In 34 A. D. he died, and as he left no children, his dominions were added by Tiberius to the province of Syria. In 37 A. D. they were given by Caligula to Agrippa (Ant. xviii. 4, 6; 6, 10).

270. Before turning back to unfold the history of Judea during the times of the early procurators, it will be best to complete the story of Jewish-Idumean control by following the fortunes of Agrippa, the ruler under whom for the last time all Palestine was for a short period reunited. Before he came to power by the appointment of Caligula in 37 A. D., Agrippa had had a very checkered career. He had known the joys of brilliant social life in Rome, had gone the round of dissipation and by a reckless extravagance had involved himself in debts which compelled him to leave Italy; he had even meditated committing suicide. At one time he was overseer of markets at Tiberias and, losing this position, took up the rôle of an adventurer, serving in any cause for a little money and, whenever he could, borrowing more. In this way he came again finally to Italy, where he would have been received by Tiberius, had not the story of his huge, dishonest debts overtaken him and aroused the emperor's anger. By

insinuating address and specious promises, however, he borrowed of one to pay another. In the meanwhile he gained a hold upon the royal household, and a strong attachment grew up between him and Caius Caligula. The great hope on which Agrippa rested his future was that Caius might become emperor. One day he unthinkingly expressed this in the presence of Caligula's coachman and the man used the unguarded speech to avenge Agrippa's charge upon him of theft, by repeating it to Tiberius. The result was that Agrippa was thrown into prison, where he remained for six months until Tiberius died (Ant. xviii. 6, 1-10).

271. One of the first acts of Caligula was to restore to honor his imprisoned friend, and he accomplished this in a truly royal manner. He put a diadem upon Agrippa's unworthy head and appointed him king over the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias. Agrippa did not return to Palestine, however, until 39 A. D., and while there he wrote the letter to Caligula which caused the banishment of Antipas and prepared the way for the addition of the tetrarch's territories to his new kingdom. Meanwhile Caligula was manifesting that form of insanity which involved him in widespread trouble. He became firmly convinced of his divinity and regarded any refusal to worship him as an evidence of personal hostility (Ant. xviii. 7, 2; xix. 1, 1). The Jews were thus forced into antagonism to the emperor, and the first outbreak occurred in Alexandria, as Agrippa was passing through from Rome to Palestine in August, 38 A. D. Though the Jewish king was scrupulously careful about provoking any ill-will, his presence in Alexandria, in royal garb,

was a sufficient pretext to give expression to the real motive, — namely, hatred of the Jews, — which impelled the Greeks and Egyptians to wholesale plundering and murder in the Jewish quarter. During the whole time of Caligula's reign the burning question in Alexandria was concerning the worship of the emperor. Palestine could not, of course, escape the mad desire of the insane Roman, who demanded that a statue of himself should be set up in the temple. Petronius, the governor of Syria, was ordered to carry this command into execution, and if necessary, with the assistance of the army (Ant. xviii. 8, 2). The effect upon the country was overwhelming. "Like a cloud the multitude of Jews covered all Phœnicia" (Ad Caium sect. 32), in their eagerness to petition Petronius against the threatened sacrilege. Agrippa, who in 40 A. D. had returned from Palestine to Rome, first heard the news from the emperor himself. Shocked and deeply troubled, he summoned all his resources to bring about a change of the emperor's purpose. A costly banquet and flattering attentions won the good-will of Caligula, from whom at great risk Agrippa ventured to make request for the rescinding of the command regarding the statue. The request, however, was granted, and before new trouble could arise, Caligula was assassinated in January, 41 A. D. (Ant. xviii. 8, 7, 8; xix. 1, 1-14).

272. Agrippa now had an opportunity of saving Rome and ultimately himself. By adroit measures and prudent advice, he helped Claudius to the vacant throne and secured for him the good-will of both the Roman army and senate. Claudius rewarded him by adding Samaria and Judea to his dominions, so that now


Agrippa was king over all the territory of his grandfather. Fortune had favored him beyond his highest expectations (Ant. xix. 4, 1-5; 5, 1).

273. The brief reign of King Agrippa I. (41-44 A. D.) was for Judaism a "golden day." Contrary to the prognostications which might be deduced from his previous career, this last Jewish king honored in the eyes of his subjects his high position. Whatever his sincerity, which in the case of a Herod is always questionable, he observed with care the requirements of the law. "He loved to live continually at Jerusalem and was careful in the observance of the laws of his country," says Josephus. "He kept himself entirely pure; nor did any day pass over his head without its appointed sacrifice" (Ant. xix. 7, 3). To the Pharisees he brought back the good old days of Alexandra, and they were ready to call him "brother," despite the Idumean blood in his veins (Mishna Sota vii. 8). The real Herod in him is nevertheless revealed in the fact that with all this devotion to Jewish prejudices, he was a patron of Greek culture in a city like Berytus outside of his own domains. He erected in that city a theatre, an amphitheatre, and thoroughly enjoyed Greek games whenever he felt that it was prudent to attend (Ant. xix. 7, 5).

274. His persecution of the early Christian church was part of his Jewish policy. It was because the murder of James "pleased the Jews" that he tried to lay violent hands also on Peter (Acts xii. 1-3). With this twofold policy rigidly followed, on its strict legal side, in Palestine, and, on its liberal side, elsewhere, Agrippa prospered to the extent of quieting all opposing voices except those of the zealots. To

them even he gave, by his honoring of the law, a fresh reason for wishing complete freedom from the Romans. The latter, however, watched both him and them with restless vigilance (Ant. xix. 7, 2; 8, 1).

275. In the hour of the climax of his glory there came to Agrippa the grim messenger of death. At a festival in Cæsarea he appeared upon the judgment seat in a garment heavily overladen with silver; and as the sun was reflected from the splendid robe, the people cried out in response to his words, "The voice of a god! The voice of a god!" The cry was as music to the ears of the king, but even while he listened, he was seized with severe internal pains, and carried into the palace near by, where in five days he died. Agrippa left a son bearing his name, but as he was only seventeen years old, the advisers of Claudius urged that the risk of intrusting the government to an inexperienced young man was too great. All Palestine, therefore, again came under the control of a Roman procurator (Ant. xix. 9, 2).



IX

IN THE HANDS OF ROME

276. THE chief, pressing desire of the Jewish deputation which appeared before Augustus while he was considering Herod's will was "that they might be delivered from kingly and similar governments and be added to Syria" (Ant. xvii. 11, 2). The hope which gave cogency to this petition was that the people in direct relations with Rome would have better government, less friction, and larger freedom. In any other land than Judea such a hope might have been realized under the helpful hand of Roman direction. To the Jews it could prove only delusive, since Judaism knew no interpretation of freedom which did not conform clearly to the standards of the Mosaic and traditional law.

277. The removal of Archelaus gave to expectation a keen edge. Augustus had been led by experience to modify his policy regarding vassal states within the empire, and was ready to take Judea under imperial supervision. The method by which this was accomplished was not what the Jews had looked for, and the results were more and more disastrous. In 27 B. C., Augustus divided with the Senate the care of the Roman provinces, retaining under his own direction those which were of military importance, and sending out to them, as governors, men of senatorial rank. If

among these provinces any one was difficult to manage by reason of the savage state of the people, or because of tenacious customs, an official of equestrian rank was chosen to take charge of affairs. Syria had thus a governor of high rank who was known as "legate," while Judea was of the exceptional class and was supervised by a procurator. This procurator resided at Cæsarea, was allowed a small army of auxiliary troops, — that is, troops gathered from the province, — received his salary from the imperial treasury, exercised supreme judicial authority within the province, deciding matters of life and death, and administered the department of finance. Until the time of Agrippa I., he also could appoint the high-priest. He was not entirely independent of the legate of Syria on one side, while, on the other, the Sanhedrin jealously guarded its prerogatives. The procurator's position was, indeed, so critical and potential that it could be disastrously used, if he himself were corrupt and self-seeking. Furthermore, the Roman subaltern officials felt far less concern than did the Herods for the legal prescriptions of the Pharisees and scribes. It is not strange, therefore, that the beginning of the end dates from the arrival of these "governors" in Judea. They were, almost without exception, sources of strife and disintegration. In their coming, the Jews discovered that it was not so much this or that form of foreign control that was the real cause of dissatisfaction and unrest as the foreign control itself. This, in any form, was fundamentally opposed to a true theocracy.

278. The first requirement of the new order of affairs brought this undertone of thought and feeling

to distinct realization. For the purposes of taxation a knowledge of the number and character of the population was indispensable. Augustus therefore appointed Quirinius, the new legate of Syria, to the work of reorganizing the administration of Judea upon Roman principles. A part of his duty was to take a census of the people. To Quirinius the task seemed simple enough. He had only to follow out the methods that had for a long time been familiar to Roman officials. These were to count the communities either according to houses or according to families, in order to secure a basis for the poll tax (*tributum capitis*) and to divide the fields, survey the separate divisions, and estimate their relative values as a basis for the land tax (*tributum agri*). To the astonishment of the legate, both measures met with stout opposition. They were clearly opposed to the spirit of the Jewish law. The poll tax was looked upon as a mark of slavery (*Ant.* xviii. 1, 1), and the land tax undermined the doctrine that to the Lord alone as the owner of the land did they owe payment for the blessings that came to them in the way of fruits and harvests (*J. W.* ii. 8, 1). Quirinius, however, was not a man to be balked by mere religious prejudices. He had resolutely faced stern necessities before his appointment to Syria, and he determined that the command of the emperor should be forthwith executed. Joazar, the high-priest, was able to induce the people in and around Jerusalem to submit, but the fierce spirit of antagonism was wide-spread and ready to answer any appeal to open rebellion.

279. At this time was formed that band of patriots whose watchword was the old Maccabean cry of zeal

for the law. Their creed was, "No Lord but Jehovah; no tax but that to the temple; no friend but the zealot." Josephus calls them "a new school" (Ant. xviii. 1, 6). They were rather the extreme exponents of the old school of the Pharisees. They magnified the law and with impatient spirit sought to hasten the coming of the Messiah. Judas, called the "Galilean," led this new party, and his passionate enthusiasm was disastrously contagious. No mild means were in the mind of this determined rebel against Roman authority. He justified his violence and cruelty by a professed singleness of devotion to God and his law (Ant. xviii. 1, 1). He was, as Hausrath describes him, "one of the historic, holy simpletons who aim at what is impossible and run their heads against walls; effecting nothing outwardly, and yet exercising the greatest influence because they leave an irresistible example behind them" (ii. p. 79). Judas was defeated and killed (Acts v. 37), but the spirit which he embodied lived on, and in the final struggle of the nation, defied to the last expiring breath the Roman armies.

280. Such was the beginning of Roman administration in Judea. No emperor attempted another census according to Roman methods. The people were at this time numbered and the taxes collected under the supervision of the procurator. The customs were farmed out to men who committed their collection to tax-gatherers. Our New Testament gives us some conception of the social status of these collectors of custom. They were of the refuse of the land; often associates of harlots; always despised and shunned (Matt. xi. 19; xxi. 31).

281. Of the first four procurators, Coponius, 6-9

A. D., Ambivius, 9-12 A. D., Rufus, 12-15 A. D., and Gratus, 15-26 A. D., comparatively little is known. They undoubtedly went up with an extra force of soldiery to the feast at Jerusalem to insure order; they visited all parts of the provinces and attended to grievances; they superintended the collection of taxes and kept the emperor informed in regard to all matters under their care. During this time the Sanhedrin, the highest tribunal of the nation, enjoyed a large degree of power. Herod had largely made it his tool. Now it became again the supreme court for all important matters pertaining to the law of Moses. Its jurisdiction was confined to Judea, though its general decisions had recognition far and wide in Judaism. In Judea itself it did not interfere in the sphere of the local courts of the eleven toparchies into which the province was divided, but reserved its deliberations for questions of national import. It passed laws, executed justice, tried false prophets, settled questions of doctrine, watched over priestly families to insure purity of descent; in a word, it was a court exercising legislative, administrative, and judicial functions. At the head of it was the high-priest and among its seventy members were found aristocratic priests, eminent scribes and elders, or men of years and experience (Matt. xvi. 21). These scribes and elders belonged to the party of the Pharisees. The Sadducean party, however, was well represented; but it is noteworthy that the scribes were the most influential, since they were in touch with the people (Ant. xviii. 1, 4). Roman citizens in Judea were not under its oversight unless they profaned the temple (J. W. vi. 2, 4), and the procurator, while he had the power

of calling the Sanhedrin together, was not needed to give validity to its sentences except in case of death. The functions and scope of the activity of the Sanhedrin show the large measure of local liberty given by the Romans to the Jews, but, notwithstanding the outward appearance of tranquillity, there still existed the secret restlessness of discontent.

282. Hints of this restlessness are given in the fear of commotion in Judea over the burdensome taxation in the time of Valerius Gratus (*Tac. An. ii. 42, 43*), and in references to the irrepressible activity of the zealots (*Ant. xviii. 1, 6*). The true situation, however, is revealed in the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate (26-36 A. D.), regarding whom more detailed information is given us. His contemporary, Agrippa I., describes him as a man of "unbending and recklessly hard character" (*Ad Caium, sect. 38*), and the record of his deeds confirms the description. He began his official career with an attempt to cure the Jews of their irrational prejudice against the presence of the army flags in Jerusalem, because on them was the figure of the emperor. At Pilate's command the soldiers entered the city at night bearing these flags. It is evidence enough of the interest of the people in the pressing questions of the law and Roman rule that they went down "in great numbers" to Cæsarea to protest, and were in no wise intimidated by the drawn swords of the soldiers. With necks bared they invited death rather than submit to the profanation of Jerusalem (*Ant. xviii. 3, 1*). The spirit of the zealots was very much alive, and Pilate felt it wise to yield. When afterward he took the temple treasures to build an aqueduct for the water supply of Jerusalem, even

this laudable deed stirred the city to its depths, and the procurator won new hatred by the terrible massacre he commanded (Ant. xviii. 3, 2). Not satisfied with his insult to the holy city by taking into it the flags, he determined to set up votive shields having the name of the emperor on them. Once more the city was in an uproar, and only the good sense of the emperor, who ordered the shields taken away, saved another calamity. It is not difficult to imagine the feelings of this disdainful ruler when the Jews dragged before him the quiet, earnest teacher of Galilee with a charge of seditious plotting against Rome. Because Judas, the Galilean, had done that, these same Jews honored his name. The artifice was plain enough to the procurator, and only because of his own pitiable weakness has his name been indissolubly linked with the most significant crime of history. The career of this ignoble Roman ended in the disgrace of dismissal, after a conflict with a large body of Samaritans who, deluded by Messianic expectations, had gathered at Mount Gerizim to await the consummation. It is unquestionably true that the emperors were in favor of a conciliatory policy in the treatment of the religious concerns of the Jews, but that policy was effectively frustrated by such men as Pontius Pilate and the procurators who followed him. Each one gave fresh inspiration to the energy of the zealots and helped to prepare the way for the final catastrophe.

283. Tiberius died before Pilate reached Rome, in 37 A. D., and Caligula came to power. The attempt of this infatuated self-deifier to play a rôle resembling that of Antiochus Epiphanes in his treatment of the temple kept intense for a while the feeling of dis-

quietude. Then followed the short, benign reign of Agrippa I., in which even the Pharisees almost forgot their traditional antagonism to the Herodian house. The happy time, however, was ended all too soon by the sudden death of Agrippa, and the whole land passed again under the supervision of procurators.

284. Cuspius Fadus (44-45 A. D.) was the choice of Claudius for the responsible work of administering affairs, and his vigorous attention to the needs of the country promised well, but very soon after his coming he, too, began to commit the blunders of shortsightedness. Hyrcanus II. had made a practice of keeping the costly vestments of the high-priest in the castle adjoining the temple, and in this custom Herod followed him. By some oversight, however, they were not taken away when the castle was handed over to the Romans, and the procurators had had them in their charge until 36 A. D., when Vitellius won the good-will of the people by placing them at the free disposal of the Jewish authorities. Small as the matter seems, it was, after all, of real significance to the Jews, for it was thus in the power of the Romans to interfere with the ritual of the temple. Fadus demanded possession of the vestments again, and the consequent disturbance was not quieted until a delegation, sent to Rome, obtained from the emperor the right of the priest to take charge of the sacred garments (Ant. xx. 1, 1-3). Shortly after this the custody of the temple and the right to nominate the high-priest were given to Herod of Chalcis, brother of Agrippa I. (Ant. xx. 1, 3).

285. Claudius now changed his course of procedure in so far as to appoint a Jew to the office of procura-

tor. Tiberius Alexander (45-48 A. D.) was a nephew of Philo, and, although he had renounced the religion of his fathers, it was supposed that he would sufficiently understand the sensitive conditions in Palestine to act wisely. An apostate, however, could be only an offence, and the uprising of the zealots shows that his mission was a failure.

286. The crucifixion by Alexander of James and Simon, sons of Judas, the Galilean, had only quickened the rebellious spirit abroad in the land, and when Cumanus was sent to take the place of Alexander in 48 A. D., he had at once to face a serious and threatening situation. Under cover of zeal against Roman rule, the disorderly elements of the land had resorted to robbery and destruction, for the most part, of their political opponents. All manner of desperate men sought to use the opportunity for personal gains and ends. Instead of meeting these conditions with firm, wise, and just measures, the new procurator provoked the people afresh and left the land worse than he found it. An insolent soldier among the guards, placed by Cumanus in the temple court, insulted the worshippers by an indecent posture. A quick, sharp punishment of the offender might have ended the affair; Cumanus handled it in such a way that the outcome was an utter rout of the crowd by his soldiers and the destruction of a thousand lives (Ant. xx. 5, 3). An instance of the kind of robbery above referred to occurred on the road near Jerusalem. Stephanus, a Roman official, was waylaid and stripped of all his belongings. As a punishment, Cumanus sent his soldiers to plunder all the neighboring villages. In the general recklessness of the pillaging, a soldier tore to

pieces a roll of the law, and Cumanus only saved himself from another bloody scene by putting the offender to death (Ant. xx. 5, 4). The worthless governor finally lost his position by his corrupt and cruel dealings in connection with a feud between the Samaritans and the Jews. A party of Galileans, on their way to the feast at Jerusalem, were murdered in Samaria. Cumanus, by reason of bribes, sheltered the Samaritans. The incensed Jews, under the leadership of the zealots, took terrible vengeance on Samaria, and Cumanus then turned upon the zealots and severely punished them. Both Jews and Samaritans appealed to Quadratus, governor of Syria, who sent the ring-leaders of both parties with Cumanus to Rome (52 A. D.). Through the aid of Agrippa II. the Jews were successful in defending themselves, and Cumanus was banished (Ant. xx. 6, 1-3).

287. "Then Claudius sent Felix, the brother of Pallas, to administer affairs in Judea" (52-60 A. D.). This latter date has been recently disputed; the time of the recall of Felix has been placed as early as 55 A. D. It was probably in 59 A. D. (Ant. xx. 7, 1). The comment of Tacitus upon this man's career sums up his procuratorship. "With all manner of cruelty and lust, he exercised royal functions in the spirit of a slave" (Tac. Hist. v. 9). To meet his cruelty and severity, the Sicarii made their appearance. Their doctrine was the dagger (*sica*), and dexterously they used it in putting their opponents out of the way (J. W. ii. 13, 2). There was little safety in Jerusalem, and all through the land villages were set on fire, houses were plundered, and all sympathy with Rome promptly and remorselessly dealt with (J. W.

ii. 13, 6). Felix tried in vain to stay the mad fury. His severity was powerless before the desperate fanaticism. In the impassioned expectation of the times, multitudes responded to the call of this or that pretender who promised to exhibit to them "the signs of coming freedom." An Egyptian Jew thus agreed to show all who would go with him to the Mount of Olives the destruction of the walls of Jerusalem (Ant. xx. 8, 6). As far back as the time of Cuspius Fadus the same overwrought desire for some miraculous interposition enabled Theudas to persuade many to follow him to the river Jordan, where he would divide the waters and lead them over (Ant. xx. 5, 1). It made little difference that such undertakings were summarily stopped. They were the symptoms of a fever raging in the blood of the people. Did the procurator by any means reduce the temperature, some new pretender would raise it again to the highest fever heat. The Pharisees, respected as they were, could no longer cool the hot blood of the ever-growing party of the zealots (J. W. ii. 13, 6), and among the priests in Jerusalem was developing that spirit of greed which not only destroyed their influence for good, but which did not hesitate to leave the inferior priests to die from actual starvation (Ant. xx. 8, 8). Paul had abundant reason, as he stood before the licentious and cruel Felix, to reason "of righteousness and of temperance and of judgment to come" (Acts xxiv. 24). It was a sermon that might have been addressed as well to the nation at large.

288. Two years after the appointment of Felix, Claudius was poisoned (Tac. An. xii. 66, 67), and Nero proclaimed emperor. In 60 A. D., Porcius Festus

was sent out to Palestine as procurator. Whatever good intentions he may have had in reference to the land were impossible to realize. He found virtually a state of anarchy. All the dire tendencies of the time of his predecessors were strengthened. The Sicarii became numerous, the work of plunder and destruction was increasing, and the people were still following the deceptive calls of self-constituted Messiahs (Ant. xx. 8, 10). In the midst of the confusion the procurator died in 62 A. D.

289. Agrippa II., who succeeded his uncle in the tetrarchy of Chalcis, and who afterward came to be ruler over the combined dominions of Philip, Lysanias, and Antipater, had in the mean time appointed Ananus high-priest. This high-priest, while the country was awaiting the new procurator, used his opportunity to call before the Sanhedrin James, the Lord's brother, and some others, and, having accused them of breaking the law, to order them to be stoned to death. His zeal against the church, however, cost him his position; and with the arrival of Albinus, the successor of Festus, events began to move rapidly toward the crisis of the nation. What the land had to suffer from Albinus is best told in the words of Josephus himself: "There was no wickedness that he did not practise. Not only did he embezzle public moneys, rob a multitude of private citizens, and burden the whole people with imposts, but he released captive highwaymen for ransoms from their relations; those that could not pay remained in prison. Every villain gathered a band of his own, and Albinus towered among them like a robber chief, using his adherents to plunder honest citizens" (J. W. ii. 4, 1). The zealots could wish for

no better furtherance of their cause. Riots were of frequent occurrence in the streets of Jerusalem, and these, too, between factions of the priesthood (Ant. xx. 9, 4). The completion of the temple at this time left eighteen thousand workmen without employment, an additional menace to the city; and Agrippa II., to whom appeal was made, permitted the use of the temple treasure to employ these men in paving the city with white stone. The same king granted to the Levites the illegal honor of wearing priestly garments. The temple was thus the daily witness of ceremonial lawlessness, while the city and the land were given over to the atrocities of greed and fanaticism (Ant. xx. 9, 6, 7).

290. The worst, however, was yet to come. As soon as Albinus learned that he was to be recalled, he attempted an adjustment of affairs which would appear favorable to Jerusalem, but which resulted simply in emptying the prisons and filling the country with robbers (Ant. xx. 9, 5). Gessius Florus (64-66) the last procurator, then entered upon the scene, and by his desperate wickedness cast even the rapacity and perfidy of Albinus into shadow. ¹He made an open boast of his crimes against the people; he practised every sort of robbery and abuse precisely as though he had been sent to punish condemned criminals. ²His cruelty was pitiless, his infamies shameless; never before did any one so veil truth with deceit, or discover more cunning ways of accomplishing his knaveries. ³To enrich himself at the expense of individuals was not enough for him; ⁴he robbed whole cities and ruined whole communities; things could not have been worse, had he made public proc-

lamation throughout the land that every one might plunder where and what he would, provided only that he, Albinus, received his share of the booty. Whole districts were depopulated by his greed; multitudes left their houses and fled into foreign provinces" (J. W. ii. 14, 2). The patience of the nation was now exhausted. It was ready to plunge into open, determined rebellion. Unquestionably the ceaseless agitation of the zealots inflamed more and more the minds of the people; but the stupid blunders or wilful crimes of the Roman procurators gave these enthusiasts many reasons for appeal to the prejudices and hopes of their countrymen. These reasons were diligently used, and at last the zealots had their own way. The terrible tragedy of the nation's death struggle with Rome began.

✕

X

THE FINAL CATASTROPHE

291. THE virtual declaration of war was a deliberate and formal refusal to offer the daily sacrifice in the temple for the emperor (J. W. ii. 17, 2). Since the days of Augustus this ritual service had been faithfully observed. Only in this way could Judaism with religious ceremonial honor the name that in the pagan provinces was deified and worshipped. The refusal, therefore, was a direct, open repudiation of respect and loyalty. It was an act of war. In vain did the men of wealth and power, in vain did the Pharisees, and even Agrippa II., seek to persuade the revolutionists of the stupendous folly of their action. Momentary reversals of purpose rewarded the earnestness of the defenders of peace (J. W. ii. 15, 2; 16, 4), but just as the angry tumult of passion became in a measure quieted, a fresh exasperation on the part of the Romans stirred to their depths the tides of bitter feeling, until peace seemed but another name for cowardice and shame.

292. The policy of Florus was irritation. He was eager to force the Jews into rebellion. Each resentment of his perfidy and cruelty was made by himself the reason for a more desperate procedure. A quarrel between the Greeks and Jews broke out in Cæsarea over an attempt to dishonor one of the synagogues.

Florus took a large bribe from the Jews with the promise that he would stop the insults of the Greeks, then left the city and refused to protect Jewish interests (ii. 14, 4-5). While ill-will over this treachery was at its height, a demand came for seventeen talents from the temple treasury "for Cæsar's use." Jerusalem was at once in an uproar. In sarcasm a collection was taken for the poor, needy Roman. Florus, that he might work out his will, chose to make much of the insulting joke and marched upon the city. He threatened vengeance if the perpetrators were not handed over to him, and because the Jews dared to beg pardon for the few foolish men who had been guilty of this presumption, he became enraged and set his soldiers to plundering in the city. In their savage zeal neither women nor children were spared, over three thousand being put to death (J. W. ii. 14, 6-9).

293. Not content with this, Florus planned further butchery. He commanded the people to go out and greet two cohorts coming up from Cæsarea, and at the same time charged the soldiers to ignore the greeting and, at the slightest manifestation of dissatisfaction on the part of the Jews, to use their weapons. It was with the greatest difficulty that the high-priests and others persuaded the people to go. Alas! they went, many of them, to their death. The shrewd treachery of the procurator was disastrously successful as far as the shedding of Jewish blood was concerned, but he did not get possession of the temple treasure, and returned to Cæsarea.

294. While the city was still excited over this last atrocity, two notable men arrived in Palestine, Neapolitanus, an officer from the Syrian governor, and

Agrippa II. One came to inquire into the actual situation in the land; the other to interest himself in behalf of both the Jews and the Romans. A conference of the peace party and of the Sanhedrin with these men led Agrippa to make a long and clever speech urging the people to abandon all thought of a revolution. He succeeded so well that they promised allegiance to the emperor. As showing, however, how little a passing mood like this was worth, Agrippa's attempt to persuade them to submit quietly to Florus until a change could be made for the better, raised a storm of irresistible passion. Agrippa himself was obliged to get out of the way, and, with the decision to offer no more sacrifices for the emperor, the war began.

295. The first aggressive act of the Jews was the seizure of Masada, the fortress built by Jonathan the Maccabean, and fortified by Herod. The whole Roman garrison in charge of it was put to the sword. In Jerusalem Eleazar, the son of Ananias, the high-priest, became the leader of the war party and threw his whole energy into preparation for the struggle. It was yet the hope of the high-priests and the leading Pharisees that they might avert war, and they tried to reason with the revolutionists, but to no purpose. They then changed their method and sent ambassadors to both Florus and Agrippa asking for an army to put down the sedition before it gained too great headway (J. W. ii. 17, 1-4).

296. Agrippa responded with three thousand men, and the city was divided between the two parties, the revolutionists occupying the lower city and the temple; their opponents the upper city. Daily encounters made Jerusalem a place of confusion and death. The

soldiers of Agrippa could not withstand the furious bravery of the followers of Eleazar, especially after the accession of the band of Sicarii, who, at the time of the festival of wood-carrying, gained entrance into the temple enclosure. One important position after another was taken, and the royal troops were compelled to evacuate the upper city. At the same time the palaces of the high-priest, of Agrippa, and of Berenice were destroyed by fire and, more significant still, the depositories of the public archives. In this last fire disappeared a multitude of written documents including the obligations of debtors and the various claims of men of property. From that hour the mob had little to fear from men of wealth and these were compelled to protect themselves as best they could (J. W. ii. 17, 5-6).

297. In rapid succession the revolutionists gained possession of the citadel of Antonia, destroyed the palace of Herod, discovered and murdered the high-priest Ananias, treacherously massacred the Roman garrison after a surrender under the promise of safe departure, and, with the city entirely in their hands, celebrated their triumph with merciless slaughter. In all this success, however, the zealots had not escaped trouble within their own camp. Manahem, a son of Judas the Galilean, presuming upon his achievements as a leader, gave himself the airs of a king and became insufferably tyrannical. The result was an outbreak between him and Eleazar which ended in the death of Manahem and many of his followers (J. W. ii. 17, 7-10).

298. With swift and terrible certainty hatred begets hatred. The whole land became involved in these con-

licts inspired by race enmity. Jews murdered pagans, and the pagans retaliated wherever they could. On both sides of the Jordan cities were pillaged and immense numbers slain (J. W. ii. 18, 1-8). The situation was so serious that Cestius Gallus, the Syrian legate, determined to interfere and marched southward with a large army. One part of his forces overran Galilee, another took Joppa, and then the march was made directly upon Jerusalem. At the time of the Feast of Tabernacles in A. D. 66, Gallus pitched his camp at Gabao (El Jêb), about six miles from the capital (J. W. ii. 18, 10-11; 9, 1). The Jews immediately broke off the festival and made such an impetuous attack that the Romans suffered severely. Gallus, however, drew nearer the city, and made several vigorous but unsuccessful assaults upon it. In the mean time a conspiracy of the peace party to open the gates was discovered and summarily punished. It was perhaps in the hope that the counsels of these men would prevail that Gallus did not follow up what advantages he had gained and make himself master of the city. With no apparent reason he suddenly, to the surprise of all within the walls, took his army away. Fear and depression were at once exchanged for the wildest courage. The Jews followed the retiring army, inflicting daily injury and reducing the Romans themselves well-nigh to despair. No sooner had they entered the perilous pass of Beth-horon than the insurgents saw their opportunity and with savage exultation fell upon the disheartened cohorts, completely routed them, and returned to Jerusalem laden with the spoils of war (J. W. ii. 19, 2-9). With this victory the first stage of the war

was concluded. Peace measures could no longer be thought of; the nation was inevitably committed to the consequences of its rebellious deeds.

299. Preparations were now made on both sides for the impending crisis. Nero, realizing the gravity of the situation, ordered one of his best generals, Titus Flavius Vespasian, a man of sagacity and experience, to go to Syria and take measures to put down the rebellion (J. W. iii. 1, 1-3). The Jews set about the organization of their forces and the strengthening of their position. With the exception of those who left the city because they would not take part against the Romans, all classes now became interested in the nation's cause. Those who once urged peace sought to direct in organization. Pharisees and high-priests were alike conspicuous in this work. It was probably their purpose to treat with the Romans as soon as practicable and save the nation from its own folly (J. W. iv. 5, 2). At this time they could render the most telling service in the guidance of affairs. Jerusalem itself was the scene of an eager activity. In an assembly of the people held in the temple governors and commanders were chosen for all the various parts of the land, and it is noteworthy that nearly all of them were representatives of the moderate party. In the eyes of the people men of noble station seemed, after all, their natural leaders (J. W. ii. 20, 3-4). The Sanhedrin probably managed the nominations.

300. Strangely enough, the difficult and responsible leadership of Galilee was given to the clever but inexperienced young son of Matthias, Josephus, the future historian. This rabbinical scholar, who, up to this time, had, in all likelihood, never handled a sword,

was sent to prepare the province into which the Romans would first come, and then to meet them when they did come. After establishing a form of government modelled after that of Judea in its provision of a Sanhedrin and small councils for every city, he turned to the work of strengthening the fortifications of a large number of towns and cities, among which were Jotapata, Sepphoris, Tarichæa, Tiberias, Gischala, and Gamala in Gaulonitis (J. W. ii. 20, 6). He also collected, organized, and tried to discipline after Roman methods a large army. Fidelity herself could apparently ask no more in the way of execution of a commission, and yet the zealots soon found reason for distrust and antagonism. Especially John of Gischala, who was, at first, a friend of Josephus, became suspicious of the real purpose of the young general, and turned against him with implacable hatred. He influenced the province by criticising the methods of Josephus as tame, and in reality friendly to the Romans; by denouncing his aims as traitorous, and by inciting a demand for his recall or for his death (J. W. ii. 21, 1-2). Josephus, who had given some reason for these suspicions, was placed in a critical position. Only by craft, self-abasement, and, in one instance, by actual flight did he escape the fury of the zealots (J. W. ii. 21, 3-6). Tiberias, Gamala, and Gischala, the centres of the revolutionary spirit, gave him constant trouble, while Sepphoris, with its leanings to the Romans, was also a source of anxiety. Despite these serious difficulties, however, he maintained his position by strategy and force, carrying on at the same time his preparations against the expected invasion of the Romans. Even a weighty deputation from Jerusalem, with a

recall, failed utterly in its mission, though supported by a small army and by a wide-reaching plot in Galilee (J. W. ii. 21, 7). The clever student of the Torah showed himself thus far equal to the emergencies of his really trying position. His hour of searching test was yet to come.

301. The plan of Vespasian was first to bring the country into subjection and then with his entire force to close in around Jerusalem, and by its destruction finish the war. In the spring of 67 A. D. he marched with an army of about fifty thousand men from Ptolemais into Galilee. Before leaving Ptolemais he had, at the request of the inhabitants of Sepphoris, sent them a garrison of six thousand men, an auspicious beginning, indeed, for the Romans (J. W. iii. 2, 4). The time had now come for the disciplined army of Josephus to show its training. Vespasian was approaching. Alas for the months of toil spent in trying to make soldiers of these Galileans! They fled hither and thither into the mountains on the first report of Vespasian's nearness. He gained a goodly part of Galilee without a single sword-stroke. Josephus and the few who remained with him took refuge in Tiberias (J. W. iii. 6, 2-3).

302. Vespasian now turned his attention to the strongholds. At Jotapata, several miles north of Sepphoris, a large part of the army of Josephus had sought refuge. Josephus, after an appeal to Jerusalem for help, hastened to the threatened city and for forty-seven days directed one of the most desperate conflicts of the war. Forty thousand men lost their lives in those terrible days. With stratagem after stratagem the besieged met the devices of the Romans,

while their courage was that of men determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible. At last, through a deserter's account of the hopeless and pitiable conditions within the walls, Vespasian was led to attempt an entrance in the early morning when the exhausted sentinels would be found sleeping. The plan succeeded and with wholesale slaughter the Romans avenged their own losses and suffering. Josephus, after several perilous adventures, escaped, surrendered himself to the Romans, and, upon being brought before Vespasian, cleverly assumed the rôle of a prophet, predicting that Vespasian should himself be emperor. This prophecy is not improbable; it was simply an evidence of shrewd insight into the likely result of given conditions in the Roman world. Nero was childless, and Vespasian was a highly honored officer (J. W. iii. 7-8).

303. After a brief respite at Cæsarea Philippi in the company of Agrippa II., Vespasian marched against Tiberias, whose gates were without delay opened to receive him. Tarichæa, south of Tiberias on the lake shore, was soon after the scene of frightful carnage. Titus, the son of Vespasian, undertook its subjection, and the battle raged around the city and upon the lake. A bold dash made by the Romans by way of the unprotected water-front gained the day. All Galilee was appalled at the barbarous cruelty of Vespasian's punishment and most of the towns capitulated at once. Only Gamala, Gischala, and Itabryrium on Mount Tabor yet stood out (J. W. iii. 9, 7-8; 10, 1-10).

304. Gamala, across the lake from Tarichæa, had been strongly fortified by Josephus and made a stout resistance. So severe was the loss to the Romans in

their first attack that Vespasian had to nerve the soldiers to further action. When the city fell at least nine thousand of the citizens had perished (J. W. iv. 1, 1-7, 9). In the mean time Itabryrium on Mount Tabor had fallen (J. W. iv. 1, 8), and Gischala alone remained. Titus was ordered to reduce this stronghold. Fearing the vengeance of the soldiers on this nest of sedition if it were taken by attack, Titus sought to reason with the insurgents upon the folly of resistance. John, their leader, hypocritically assented to all the arguments of Titus and promised to act in accord with them, but begged that the Romans would recognize the sacredness of the Sabbath day. Titus readily acquiesced and removed his camp so far from the city that during the succeeding night John and his band of zealots fled to Jerusalem. On the next morning the inhabitants threw open the gates to the Romans. The subjugation of Galilee was complete (J. W. iv. 2, 2-5).

305. Vespasian now led his army into winter quarters at Cæsarea and Scythopolis. In the opening spring of the year 68 A. D. he resumed his plan of operations having as its aim the isolation of Jerusalem. All of the country east of the Jordan, except the fortress of Machærus, was brought under Roman control, as were also Idumea and western Judea. Jerusalem itself was to be the next point of attack, when news came of the death of Nero in June, A. D. 68. Vespasian at once suspended hostilities and awaited word from Rome. Tidings at last came of the choice of Galba as emperor, and Titus was sent to Italy to greet him and to receive his commands. At Corinth Titus learned of the murder of Galba (Jan. A. D. 69), and

returned forthwith to his father (J. W. iv. 9, 2; Tac. Hist. ii. 1, 4). Vespasian again waited until June, when he began operations in Judea which gave him control of all the outlying districts and fortresses except Masada and Herodium. In July the legions in the East proclaimed him emperor, and the acceptance of this exalted position compelled him to hand over to his son the further conduct of the war. The prediction of Josephus had come true. Vespasian in gratitude gave his prophet-prisoner freedom, and with it substantial honor (J. W. iv. 10, 3-7; Suet. Vesp. 5-6).

306. Meanwhile Jerusalem had become the scene of civil war with all its attendant calamities. As the defeat of Cestius Gallus had virtually put the aristocracy at the head of the revolution, so the subjugation of Galilee had sufficiently proved their inefficiency. It was time for them to give place to men of surer purpose and abler plans. So, at least, thought John of Gischala and all like him who, during the year, had gathered from different parts of the land to Jerusalem. The Zealots should be at the helm. This doctrine they put into practice by imprisoning and murdering some of the foremost men in the city. Then they appointed a new high-priest, Phannias by name, who was utterly unfitted for the office, and with a high hand they attempted the management of affairs. Ananias, the true high-priest, as well as other prominent priests and rabbis, made appeal to the people against this robber government. They arose and shut up the Zealots in an inner court of the temple. A worse enmity than that inspired by the Romans now held high carnival in Jerusalem (J. W. iv. 3, 1-12).

307. The Zealots were in a critical position. They were as good as lost unless they could get aid from the outside. At the suggestion of John of Gischala two messengers were sent to the Idumeans with the story that Ananias and the moderate party were about to betray the city to the Romans, and that help must come quickly if Jerusalem, and those who cared for its liberty were to be saved. The Idumeans, completely deceived, responded to the call as quickly as possible with an army of twenty thousand men. Upon their arrival at Jerusalem, the closed gates and the non-appearance of the Zealots made them at first suspicious, and a terrific thunder-storm seemed to them as a warning from God, but in the midst of the uproar of rain and wind the Zealots sawed open the gates and guided their allies into the city. Once inside, the bloodthirsty, marauding spirit of the semi-barbarians broke forth, and the streets were drenched with blood (J. W. iv. 4; 5, 1). The fury of both Zealots and Idumeans was directed against the leaders of the moderate party, many of whom perished. At last, however, after almost incredible savagery, the Idumeans discovered that they had been deceived and left the city (J. W. iv. 5, 5; 6, 1).

308. At some time amid these troubles the Christians escaped to Pella. Vespasian's generals kept urging him to advance upon the capital, but he was satisfied that Jerusalem was rapidly enough destroying itself. As long as John of Gischala was within its walls, the Romans need make no haste. The fixed policy of clearing the whole surrounding country of foes could be steadily pursued. Meanwhile after the departure of the Idumeans the reign of terror contin-

ued in Jerusalem. The ranks of the "valiant men and men of good families" were sadly thinned (J. W. iv. 6, 1-3).

309. While John was tyrannizing in the capital, a certain Simon, son of Giora, bold, adventurous, and eager to command, gathered about him a strong body of men, and by successful raids in southern Palestine made himself feared not only in the south country, but in Jerusalem. The Zealots went out against him. In the first engagement they were worsted, and Simon was prevented from making an assault upon the city only by the insufficiency of his forces. Later the Zealots captured his wife, but dearly the ruffian made many innocent lives pay for this effrontery. And now the lawlessness and excesses of John's soldiery in the city suggested the feasibility of "driving out the devil by Beelzebub." The moderate party and many of the suffering Zealots invited Simon to enter the city and deliver them from John. Rightly does Josephus say that the remedy was worse than the disease itself. One more was added to the warring factions in the city. Three hostile armies were pitted against one another. Eleazar at the head of one party of Zealots held the inner court of the temple; John and his band the temple mount, and Simon the city. Day by day Jerusalem resounded with the din of fighting. "The people between the combatants were like a great body torn to pieces." All that cunning and cruelty could accomplish was perpetually sought out and done. Lamentation and death were in every house. While the daily sacrifice was continued, — a hollow mockery of service, — the buildings all about the temple were burned, grain-supplies, the very life of the city, were

destroyed, and a good part of the city itself made desolate. The insane fury of these factions, continuing through months, made the terrified and suffering inhabitants actually wish for the coming of the Romans. Nothing could be worse than the useless, hopeless strife which was, after all, but national suicide (J. W. v. 1, 2-5; Tac. Hist. v. 12).

310. At last the Romans did come. In the spring of 70 A. D., just before the Passover, Titus appeared. Incautious advances at first caused him much loss; consequently, giving up thought of storming the city, he began a regular siege on April 23. While he was making his first approaches to the city, treacherous dealing on the part of John put an end to the party of Eleazar. The latter opened the gates of the temple for worshippers, and John smuggled in enough of his adherents, with concealed weapons, to gain the mastery of the inner court (J. W. v. 3, 1). Eleazar was himself murdered. It was not until the threatening work of the siege had begun that the two parties gave up their own animosities and joined their forces against a common foe.

311. The siege lasted from April until September, five months full of desperate undertakings, astonishing endurance, matchless cruelty, and terrible issues. With force has it been said that "scarcely on another occasion in history has the spectator the same feeling of irredeemable ruin, of inevitable destruction, as in the case of the fall of Jerusalem in the year 70 A. D." Titus began his attack on the north side of the city, since everywhere else it was impregnable. Here he met the outer wall, or the wall of Agrippa, which extended around Bethzetha (see Appendix IV.). On

the fifteenth day of the siege a breach was made by the battering-rams, and the Romans pitched camp within the city (J. W. v. 7, 2-3). Orders were then given to storm the second wall, which, running from the gate Gennath in a general northwesterly direction to the corner of Antonia, protected the lower city. Five days after the capture of the first wall an opening was made in the second, and Titus himself led the advance into the breach. Desperate fighting ensued, and four days passed before the Romans gained the upper hand (J. W. v. 8, 1-2).

312. Titus now rested for a few days, wishing thereby to give the city time for reflection and change of purpose. Josephus was sent to persuade his countrymen to give up the unequal conflict. He was spurned and abused for his pains (J. W. v. 9, 1-4). Titus thereupon pushed on vigorously the preparations for an attack upon Antonia, and the third wall, assured that the deadly work of the famine was his best ally within the city. Indeed, to make its ravages more certain, he built a rough wall about the city that none might escape (J. W. v. 12, 1-2). The first ramparts erected against Antonia and the third wall were burned by the insurgents, and in order to replace them the country for miles around was stripped of timber (J. W. v. 12, 4). It was a critical moment in the siege when these ramparts were finished, for they could not be rebuilt without great difficulty and they were decisive of the city's fate if they remained. Desperate fighting ensued, and the Romans not only broke down the third wall, but also an additional wall, which, to their surprise, had been built by John of Gischala immediately behind it. Then followed the

capture of the fortress of Antonia, which, by the order of Titus, was razed to the ground (J. W. vi. 1, 7-8; 2, 1).

313. The temple yet remained, and Titus made another appeal to those within its enclosure to surrender, and so to save their sacred shrine from pollution. Josephus was once more the messenger of the Romans, but in vain (J. W. vi. 1, 1-2). Then timbers were brought from long distances and ramparts built for attack. On the 17th of July the daily sacrifice, from lack of both priests and animals, ceased forever (J. W. vi. 2, 1). The simple statement of Josephus is alike a tribute to the ceremonial faithfulness of Judaism, and a sign of its accomplished mission. The smokeless altar was soon to be part of the débris of a desolated city. While the ramparts against the temple were being built the Romans suffered some sharp reverses (J. W. vi. 3, 1-2), but on the 8th of August the battering rams began their work. Their heavy blows availed but little against the massive walls, so the gates were set on fire, and through the openings thus made the Romans rushed, eager for vengeance. Titus tried to save the temple, but the infuriated soldiers were beyond control, and the whole structure was soon in flames. There was just time to secure the sacred vessels. Then the glory of Jerusalem disappeared, to be seen no more. A merciless slaughter added its agonies to the awful scene (J. W. vi. 4, 1-7). "The great tribulation" of our Lord's prophecy was being fulfilled.

314. In the upper city the revolutionists made their last stand. John of Gischala escaped with many of his followers from the temple and joined Simon, and

they both asked permission to leave the country. Titus refused, and the siege of this last, unconquered section began. While the Romans worked outside the wall, Simon and John fought each other on the inside, each in addition destroying all who had any sympathy with Rome until about eight thousand perished. At length the ramparts were finished, the Romans scaled the walls, and on the 8th of September the whole area of Jerusalem was conquered (J. W. vi. 8, 1-5). Fire and sword completed the desolation. In the words of Josephus "there was left nothing to make those who came thither believe that the place had ever been inhabited."

315. The three fortresses, Herodium, Machærus, and Masada were still in the possession of the rebels. Herodium soon surrendered, and Machærus later took the same course. In Masada dwelt the fierce spirit of indomitable fanaticism. When it became unmistakably evident that the garrison could hold out but a day longer, Eleazar, the commander, called his supporters together and proposed that they kill first their wives and children, then each other to the last man, who should commit suicide. By an eloquent plea, setting forth the brutal cruelty of the Romans and the sure gain to them all in the soul's blessed immortality, he nerved his hearers alike by fear and hope to the desperate undertaking. They tenderly embraced their wives, kissed the children, and then began the bloody work. Nine hundred and sixty perished; only two women and five children escaped by hiding in a cavern. The last man set fire to the palace and ran a sword through his own body (J. W. vii. 8, 9). In April A. D. 73 the war was completely finished.

316. The Jewish state had fallen; Judaism was still to live on. The Romans had triumphed; the spirit whose inspiration and aim were in the law was unconquerable. The temple was 'gone; the synagogue needed neither Gerizim nor Moriah. A dispensation had come to an end: the Messianic hope must wait its glad, certain fruition. Judea became the property of a Roman emperor; the wide world became the dwelling-place of the Jews.

317. In the triumphal procession which filled the streets of Rome with excitement in the summer of 71 A. D., John of Gischala and Simon ben-Giora marched side by side before the victor's chariot, and after them seven hundred chosen Jewish captives. With curious eyes the crowds gazed upon the sacred vessels of the temple as they were borne along. How great the honor of it all was is witnessed even yet in the arch which in the Eternal City bears the name of Titus. The Romans have gone, but the Jews are still the nation of the law and the Messianic hope.

Algebra
2-4-3
Plain & Solid Geometry

XI

GLIMPSES OF JUDAISM IN PALESTINE AFTER THE WAR AND OF JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION

318. IN a war involving religious convictions, the issue never alters the convictions. The truthfulness of a creed cannot be decided by the clash of arms. Defeat may be interpreted as chastisement, but not as utter condemnation. With its capitol and temple in ruins, with thousands of its defenders cut down, and with its land and cities in the possession of the heathen, Judaism yet confidently believed in the righteousness of its claims and in the truthfulness of its hopes. The chastisement had been severe. It must only make surer fidelity to the law, in order that out of that fidelity might issue at last the Messianic blessing. Once and again since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes that earnest lesson had been drawn from national calamities. It seemed now to have been fairly burned into the mind of the nation.

319. The Pharisees and the rabbis became the revered authorities for the people in all matters purely Jewish. The synagogue and the schools had made unconscious preparation for such a time as this. The momentum of at least two centuries was in the swift, all-embracing movement toward Rabbinism which set in after the fall of Jerusalem. The scholar took complete place of the priest. Jamnia was made the

new centre of Judaism. Here, under a notable succession of learned men, the interpretation and expansion of the law was carried on. It made no difference that the sacrificial service had ceased. All the requirements of the temple ritual were faithfully discussed, for the time was sure to come when, as in the days of Judas Maccabeus, the elaborate system of worship should again be restored. Pathetic faith! Even while the rabbis and the people were diligently preparing for that future, the true Messiah was widening the borders of his kingdom throughout the Roman world.

320. Naturally after the bitter experiences of the war, the Romans regarded the Jews with jealous watchfulness. Even the temple of Onias in Egypt was closed, so that the nation should have no distinctive rallying-point. Judea was governed by a prætor, and the policy hitherto pursued of recognizing the Jews as a national as well as a religious community was abandoned. They were allowed the exercise of their religious customs as formerly, but compelled as sign of their subjection to pay the accustomed temple-tax to the Capitoline Jupiter. The Jewish tradition that the Sanhedrin escaped from Jerusalem to Jamnia before the siege began is quite improbable. Certainly there was no Sanhedrin after the war, though the body of rabbis in Jamnia who formed themselves into a high court aspired to make this the equivalent of the old national supreme council. They had the satisfaction of seeing their decisions recognized as authoritative and of knowing that their meetings were the central point of interest for all the Dispersion. Indeed, such contributions as once had gone to the temple went for years into the treasury of Jamnia.

321. Judaism had settled itself anew to the task which the chastisement of God had made only more definite and pressing, — obedience. While it discussed, expounded, applied the law, and at last codified all its results in the Mishna, it kept alive the hopes of the nation for the future. In those parts of the Apocalypse of Baruch and IV. Esdras which were written after the destruction of Jerusalem, and before the end of the first century, there are the same comfort for loss, the same inspiration to zeal, and the same promise of better things to come that in earlier distresses made precious to the Jews the Books of Daniel, of Enoch, or the Psalms of Solomon.

322. Owing to the meagreness of accurate information, it is difficult to estimate the actual status of the population in Palestine immediately after the war. Galilee, Judea, and Idumea had, indeed, suffered immense losses, but in the comparative rest which the land enjoyed during the reigns of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, there seems to have been a rapid recuperation. Meanwhile, led on by its hopes and goaded by the exactions of its conquerors, the regathered people were approaching their second awful crisis.

323. Unmindful of the disastrous issues of A. D. 70, and heedless of all warnings concerning the strength of its foe, Judaism in Palestine, in the year 132 A. D., dared once more to risk all in war. The immediate occasion was Hadrian's determination to build a heathen city on the site of Jerusalem and, climax of desecration, a temple to Jupiter on the old temple mount. The outrage was beyond endurance. All the pent-up feelings of sixty years broke forth in volcanic fury. The fretting, exasperating requirements of the Romans had

worn on the temper of the nation until it virtually became insane. A clever trickster, styled Bar-Cochba, the Son of a Star, was accepted as the Messiah, and followed through suffering and blood to ruin. By his side stood the very pride of the schools, Rabbi Akiba, of whom tradition related that a thousand volumes would not contain the wonderful things which he did and said. Akiba, the Rabbi, the herald of Bar-Cochba the Pretender,—and both woful deceivers of the people! Reason had again forsaken Judea. Had we any such record of this war of three years and over (132–135 A. D.) as Josephus has given us in that which ended in the fall of Jerusalem, it would be as full of daring deeds, pitiless suffering, atrocious cruelties, and bitter issues. Says Dio Cassius, “All Judea was well-nigh a desert. Fifty fortresses and nine hundred and eighty-five villages were destroyed; five hundred and eighty thousand men fell in battle, while the number of those who succumbed to their wounds and to famine was never reckoned” (lxi. 14).

324. It was the last serious struggle for national independence. Then and there ended, not the dreams of future national glory, but the desperate, useless sacrifices of thousands upon thousands of lives in order to make those dreams real. Judaism, indeed, lived on,—a stern, uncompromising, separating power. With intenser zeal than ever it worked toward its ideals, spurning the Gentiles and making its own followers strangers in the earth. The stamp which the Roman period of its history placed upon it has never been effaced. In refusing the true Messiah it missed its splendid opportunity to become the great missionary force of the centuries. It is still in the nations, but

not of them,—cherishing its traditions, claiming its prerogative as of the chosen people and revealing the vigor of its adherents in the commercial and intellectual life of the world.

325. To a large degree the Judaism of the Dispersion embodied the spirit of that of the home-land. As long as the temple stood and the feasts were kept, there was more than one bond of union between Jerusalem and the remote parts of the earth. Contributions for the maintenance of the temple service were regularly collected and forwarded through responsible deputies to the capitol, while at the time of the sacred festivals, the highways leading to the holy city were thronged with pilgrims. "Many thousands of people," says Philo, "from many thousands of towns, made pilgrimages to the temple at every festival, some by land, some by sea, and coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south" (De Monarchia ii. 1). The glory of his faith must have seemed to the Jew never more real than at those seasons of imposing ritual when from Babylon on the east to Rome on the west his people came from every land and from the islands of the sea to worship Jehovah. The fate of Judea was therefore of the deepest interest over the wide extent of the Roman Empire.

326. And yet to these people scattered abroad over the earth, either by the issues of war or by the impulse of trade, the religious institution of most vital import was the synagogue. With its interpretations of the law and its calls to fidelity, it stood over against the environment of pagan customs and culture, and the varying aspects of Judaism in different parts of the world are the result of the interaction of this central

force and its surrounding influences. Whatever modifications, however, of language, custom, or thought were thus brought about, the inmost life was true to the law. The Jew was still a Jew.

327. Already we have noted in part the process of this interaction in the Judaism of Egypt (sects. 78-88). It reached its climax in the work of Philo Judæus, and through him exerted a telling influence upon Alexandrian thinking in the early Christian centuries. This noble, earnest, broad-minded thinker was born of high parentage in Alexandria about 20 B. C. All the literary treasures of both Judaism and of Hellenism he made his own, and in the wide range of their characters and teachers one stood forth to his view as supreme,—the inspired law-giver of Israel, Moses. He was the teacher to all men and ages of the deep things of being. Hence when rightly interpreted, he must give us the truth which philosophy had often only dimly apprehended. To show that he does, Philo applied with unsparing hand the allegorical method to the interpretation of Scripture. Much of its history disappears, all anthropomorphic conceptions of God are dismissed, and philosophic views appear, which strangely change the simple faith of the days of old. While Jesus in Galilee was telling of the Father and his love, Philo was describing God as "the Simply Existent;" while Jesus was showing himself to be the Incarnate Word, Philo was struggling with his conceptions of the Logos, making it seemingly only "personified reason." The great Alexandrian was, as Keim calls him, "a man of fusion and reconciliation" (Jesus of Nazara i. 282). Moses and Plato had each a part in his conceptions and for-

mulations of truth. His work is the finest fruitage of the Hellenistic Judaism of Egypt, — a Judaism which, after all, was deeply interested in all the conflicts between the Jewish and the heathen world.

328. As the result of Caligula's insane desire to be worshipped, a terrible persecution in the year 38 A. D. swept away much of the costly property and many lives of the Jews in Alexandria. Philo was sent to Rome to make appeal to Caligula himself, but gained little satisfaction. Only the death of the emperor ended the bloody disputes over this maddening issue. With all its openness to the influences of surrounding culture, Alexandria's Judaism did not depart from the great underlying principles of her faith.

329. It is well just at this point to emphasize, as contrary to Caligula's procedure, the generally favoring policy of the Roman emperors toward the Jews of the Dispersion. Such instances as their banishment from Rome by Tiberius in A. D. 19 (Ant. xviii. 3, 5), and later by Claudius (Acts xviii. 2), are exceptional and had their occasion in the conduct of the Jews themselves, as did also the terrible massacres of the times of Trajan and Hadrian. The right to assemble unmolested in their synagogues where, indeed, they might have their hopes of ultimate, national supremacy quickened, was graciously given them throughout the extent of the Roman dominions. Nor was this all. To avoid friction, exemption from military service was conceded to them (Ant. xiv. 10, 6, 10, 13, 14, 18), and because their law was expanded so as to apply to all the activities of life, they were allowed their own tribunals for the adjudication of all matters purely Jewish. In many cities they enjoyed

civic rights, and to them was given the privilege of becoming Roman citizens with consequent exemption from degrading punishment and with the right of appeal to the emperor.

330. Such privileges help us to understand the extent, character, and importance of the Jewish Dispersion. It faced the Romans in every centre of influence within the empire. In Africa, Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy its spirit was the same. It was really a contradiction within the empire itself. It resisted all fusion and demanded especial recognition. Nay, more, it sought diligently, earnestly, and successfully to widen its outreach and power by sharing its blessings and hopes with all who would accept its teachings and life.


331. The impress of this desire to save the heathen is upon nearly all Græco-Jewish literature. It is apologetic in tone and intensely practical in aim. It offers to a sin-blinded age the cure which can be wrought by the vital acceptance of the doctrines of a holy God and a pure moral life. While the pagan world in general despised these "separatists" who thus appealed to it, and envied even to destructive violence their temporal prosperity, many listened to the good tidings and became "God-fearing" attendants upon the synagogal worship.

332. From all these facts the twofold interest of the Dispersion is apparent,—one in the development of events in Judea; the other in the conservation and strengthening of all the influences of which the synagogue was the centre. Out of one came the thrill of anguish and deep indignation, when the temple fell in hopeless ruin; out of the other, the new

zeal to make the law and the nation's final hope the staying power of faith.


333. Through the reigns of Titus (79-81 A. D.), Domitian (81-96 A. D.), Nerva (96-98 A. D.), on to the later years of Trajan (98-117 A. D.), the Dispersion remembered its destroyed capitol and widened the cleft between itself and the Gentile world. Domitian attempted some restrictive measures, but there was no serious disturbance. The outbreak came while Trajan was in Mesopotamia. Like a prairie fire driven by the wind, the fierce flame of revolution swept along the northern coast of Africa. In Alexandria and Cyrene multitudes fell, both of Jews and Greeks, while the island of Cyprus was deluged with blood. At the same time, in Mesopotamia Trajan's general, Lucius Quietus, cut down the rebellious Jews without mercy. The mighty uprising was finally stayed. It was apparently the desperate attempt of the Dispersion to bring in the dominion of Israel. Palestine was soon to follow the terrible example (sect. 323). Then with the political question forever at rest, Judaism, both in Palestine and throughout the world, gave itself to the working out of its destiny. So it must work on till the fulness of the Gentiles is accomplished, and all its old earthly dreams are glorified in the bright fulfilment of the true Messiah's day.

APPENDICES



APPENDIX I

THE SELEUCIDÆ



¹ The numbers indicate the order of succession.


² During 150-145 B.C. the usurper Alexander Balas ruled. Demetrius was twice on the throne. While he was a prisoner in Parthia, Antiochus VII. ruled.

³ After a reign of eleven years, Grypos was driven out by Cyzicenos, who ruled as sole monarch for two years. Grypos then returned and regained all but Coele-Syria.

⁴ These sons were in almost constant conflict for twelve years; hence, Tigranes of Armenia ruled Syria from 88 to 69 B.C.


APPENDIX II

THE GENEALOGY OF THE HASMONEANS




APPENDIX III

THE HOUSE OF THE HERODS



APPENDIX IV



SUPPOSED LINE OF WALLS ABOUT JERUSALEM IN 70 A.D.

APPENDIX V

ARE THERE MACCABEAN PSALMS?

FOR the study of the inner life and spirit of Judaism during the Maccabean period, it were no small gain if, to our sources of information, we might add the long list of Psalms declared by Reuss to have originated in this period (*Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Test.* sect. 481). Indeed, with the smaller number acknowledged by Grätz (*Psalmen*, pp. 48-50), we should have an excellent store of material from which to form conceptions of the religious attitude of the nation in its struggles with Syria and in its times of crisis. There is, however, no clear and indisputable criterion for dating any of these Psalms in the Maccabean era. Even among those who contend for an enrichment of the Psalter during this period, there is much diversity of opinion about the extent of that enrichment, except in the case of some four or five psalms. The treatment of the subject affords easy opportunity for purely subjective criticism. Specific dates are often determined upon slender evidence. It is one thing to see in the thought and phraseology of a psalm suitable means for the expression of a particular mood at some given time; it is quite another to declare that at that time the mood produced the psalm. For example, the forty-fourth psalm reveals the deep trouble of lives that are "cast off," "put to confusion," "made a reproach to their neighbors," "a proverb among the nations," and yet had not forgotten God nor "stretched out their hands to any strange God." All this fits in a general way the situation at the time of

the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, but, if we may trust careful interpreters, is applicable to earlier troubles in the history of the people. So also in regard to Psalms seventy-four and seventy-nine, which are also confidently placed within the Maccabean era, there is the same possibility of earlier reference. The words, "there is no more any prophet," and the statement, "they have burned up all the synagogues in the land," seem decisive for the Maccabean date; but it is noteworthy that the Septuagint correctly puts the word "feasts" in place of "synagogues," and that several particulars given in the psalm were not realized at the time of the Maccabean uprising. Such, for example, are the burning of the temple itself (lxxiv. 7), and the *prolonged* desolation referred to in the earnest cry of the psalmist (lxxiv. 10; lxxix. 5). The surprising success of Judas Maccabeus enabled the Jews to rededicate the temple within three years after its profanation under Antiochus. It requires a nice balancing of details to make it certain that the psalms do not fit into the situation succeeding the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Interpreters are by no means agreed upon the historical period reflected in these two psalms. The fourth in the list of psalms, about whose Maccabean date there is some confident assertion, is quite indefinite in its historical reference, so much so that it may be said that "there is no period in Jewish history known to us with which the position of affairs as indicated in this psalm (the eighty-third) is in complete correspondence." If, therefore, the historical situations indicated in the psalms give us no clear, unquestionable date, are there other considerations which argue for an earlier origin than in the time of the Maccabees? The answer to this question carries us into the region of the perplexing inquiries which arise in connection with the formation of the Psalter itself. If one assumes that the canon of the Old Testament

was virtually completed in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, a decision regarding Maccabean psalms becomes simplicity itself. Because, however, to many such an early date for the completion of the canon is an assumption, we must seek for unquestioned data upon which to base an argument. The first of these is found in the Septuagint Version, which contained the whole Psalter. Unfortunately we can only conjecture about the date of the completion of this version. In 132 B. C. the grandson of Jesus, the son of Sirach, refers to a Greek version of "the law, the prophets, and the other writings." Were this testimony more specific in its reference to the "other writings," the case might rest here. The uncertainty, however, regarding the actual contents of this third group makes the witness serviceable toward establishing the fact of a canon made up of three distinct groups of books, but does not define the third group. Dillman finds no testimony in the Book of Sirach to the Psalter. Granting that the Greek version of the Psalter is to be dated as late as 100 B. C., we still are confronted with difficulties regarding Maccabean Psalms. These difficulties arise in connection with the titles affixed to the Psalms themselves. Most of the Psalms accepted as Maccabean are found in Books II. and III. of the Psalter. The contents of these books may be conveniently arranged in three divisions: the Psalms of David, li.-lxxii.; those of Korah, xlii.-xlix., and those of Asaph, l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii. Such classification and arrangement as this, together with some facts that become apparent in the study of the arrangement, implies processes which require considerable time. Some of these processes are: (a) the grouping of the psalms which had previously received a common title, such as, "A psalm of Asaph." (b) The redaction which is declared to have taken place by those claiming that there are Maccabean psalms, of the greater

part of the collections forming Books II. and III. by the change of the name Jehovah to Elohim. It is to be noted in passing, that if the Maccabean psalms were added after this second process was completed, they, too, were made "Elohistic;" and the supposed reason for this change is their insertion among the psalms to be used in the temple service, but their general tone was not suited to this purpose. (c) The arrangement of the entire Psalter after it was collected and the variation in the numbering of the psalms (see Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 272). These processes, in which the most generally accepted Maccabean psalms are involved, require seemingly a longer time than their supposed origin allows. Emphatically is this the case with the seventy-ninth psalm, if the quotation in I. Maccabees vii. 17 (c. B. C. 100), recognizing the psalm as Scripture, is rightly referred. Uncertainty, therefore, regarding the historical situation, and grave difficulties connected with their admission into the Psalter, as it seems to have been collected and arranged, warrant no unqualified usage of these so-called Maccabean psalms as sources of information for this heroic period.

Works for reference upon this question : —

The Poetry and the Religion of the Psalms, James Robertson, 1898.

The Canon of the Old Testament, Ryle, 1895.

The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, Robertson-Smith, 1892.

The Literature of the Old Testament, Kautzsch, 1897.

The Psalms, Cambridge Bible for School, Kirkpatrick, 1891.

The Psalms, Perowne, 1876.

The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter ; also Jewish Religious Life after the Exile, Cheyne, 1889, 1898.

Lectures on Inspiration, Sanday, 1894.

APPENDIX VI

BOOKS OF REFERENCE UPON JEWISH HISTORY

THE Maccabean period, apart from its own history, is significant in that the new development of the nation's life after the exile reaches therein a critical stage. The ulterior limit of the period is just this side of the range of those critical theories which have made the Persian and Greek periods so important in the life and literature of the Jewish people, and yet the period must be studied in the light of those theories as well as from the facts it itself offers for the elucidation of its character and significance. The recent valuable work done upon the literature of these inter-testamental times has added to our knowledge in such particulars as call for modification at certain points of our conception of the history as given by Ewald, Grätz, Stanley, Milman, Renan, and Holtzman. The invaluable work of Grätz needs careful questioning at those points where tradition is woven into the narrative and where the literature of the period is cited and used. In addition to the critical handling of events in the commentaries of Fritzsche, Grimm, Bissell, and Wace upon the apocryphal books, careful reckoning must be had with Wellhausen in his third edition of his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1897. Schürer's monumental work, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, is a veritable treasure-house of materials for the student of this and of the Roman period, and it is matter for regret that the new edition is not yet at hand. Its conclusions upon the literature of these periods must be tested by the work of such scholars as Charles and Deane, whose

study of apocryphal literature has been peculiarly helpful. Valuable articles embodying the latest results of criticism upon this literature will be found in the new Bible dictionaries by Hastings and Cheyne.

Of the deepest interest to the student of the New Testament is the development of Jewish theology during the two centuries preceding Christ's incarnation. In addition to the works of Drummond and Stanton, *The Jewish Messiah* and *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, we have a critical history of the eschatology of this period by R. H. Charles, D.D., 1899. Weber's *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, 1897, also presents a clear, full view of such theological conceptions as Jesus had to face. In Toy's *Judaism and Christianity*, the religious development of the Judaism of this period is set forth with discrimination and power. A rich store of materials for this phase of the history is to be found in Cheyne's *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, 1889, and in his recent work, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, 1898. It is in the Maccabean period that the religious parties come clearly into the field of history. For the study of the origin, spirit, and history of the Pharisees and Sadducees, Wellhausen's *Pharisäer und Sadducäer* is yet of prime importance. Valuable chapters upon these two parties are to be found in Keim's *Life of Christ*, and Haus-rath's *New Testament Times*, and upon the Essenes in Lightfoot's essay affixed to his commentary on Colossians and Philemon. Morrison, in his *Jews under the Roman Rule*, 1890, also discusses with considerable fulness and care the problem of Essenism in Jewish history.

The history of Judaism in Egypt is bound up with that of the different sovereignties in that much-ruled land. As a component part of the history of Egypt, the position, power, and ambitions of Judaism are set forth by Mahaffy,

in his *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, 1895, *Greek Life and Thought*, 1887, and a *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1899. They all give a vivid picture of the background of Judaism in this period, as does also Milne's *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, 1898, for the Roman period.

The greatest name in Alexandrian Judaism is that of Philo Judaeus. A recent work by Edward Herriot, *Philon Le Juif*, 1898, gives a thorough study of this master of Græco-Jewish thought. The book also embodies an interesting review of the interaction of Judaism and Hellenism in Alexandria. As a help to the understanding of the Hellenistic environment of Judaism, not only in Egypt, but elsewhere, Droysen's *History of Hellenism* is of much value.

While research has been constantly active in reference to the literature which contributes to our knowledge of the development of Judaism, exploration has been equally interested in making definite the localities and scenes of its history. The results of the fine work of the Palestine Exploration Society have been given to us in various forms. An example of the value of a close personal acquaintance with the land as an assistance to the imagination in making real and vivid the history is to be found in Conders' *Judas Maccabeus*, 1894; and for the entire history of the Jews in Palestine, George Adam Smith's *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*,—a new edition of which is just announced. Valuable books of reference embodying the results of all recent geographical work are Buhl's *Geographie des alten Palästina*, 1896, Starck's *Lexikalisches Hilfsbuch Palästina und Syrien*, 1894, and Stewart's *The Land of Israel*, 1899. The work of Dr. Bliss on *Excavations at Jerusalem*, 1894–1897, contains the latest material for the study of the topography of the Holy City.

The conquest of the Jews by Pompey, in 63 B. C., brought the land into such relations with the Roman power that its history became part of the history of the Roman sovereignty. Rome's methods, policy, and changes in rulership have, therefore, a significant bearing upon the welfare and progress of the Jews. One of the best recent works presenting the interrelation of the two histories, Rome and Judea, is Morrison's *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 1890. The great histories of Rome by Merivale and Mommsen are indispensable to a full understanding of those changes in the Roman world which had their effect upon Palestine. To be sure, the little land upon the eastern side of the Mediterranean was comparatively insignificant, but the Jews were always influential out of all proportion to the size of their land, and Rome's history affected them at many more points than at Joppa, or Jerusalem, or Ptolemais. The coming of the Romans resulted in a complete reorganization of the government. The political history of this period is carefully worked out in Mommsen's *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, vol. ii., 1886, and in Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Band I. 1881. Keim, in his *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. i., and Hausrath, in his *New Testament Times*, vol. ii., have also valuable chapters upon the political situation in Judea in Roman times. A recent work from the pen of Professor Ramsay, *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* has given new light upon the matter of enrolments during the reign of Augustus.

In the department of archæology Madden's *Coins of the Jews*, 1881, gives a very full account of the coinage of both the Maccabean and Roman periods.

For a sifted and classified collection of traditions bearing upon the history of both periods, we turn to Derenbourg's *Essai sur l'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine*; and for questions concerning the canon, Ryle's *The*

Canon of the Old Testament, 1895, Kautzsch's *Literature of the Old Testament*, 1897, and Sanday's *Bampton Lectures on Inspiration*, 1894, will be found eminently serviceable.

The following recent works upon this general period are a sign of the deepening interest in this comparatively unknown portion of Jewish history: Streane's *The Age of the Maccabees*, 1898, a work valuable for its treatment of the literature of the period; Moss's *From Malachi to Matthew*, 1899, a concise, scholarly presentation of the history of the Jews from the time of the prophecy of Malachi to the birth of Jesus; Fairweather's *From the Exile to the Advent*, 1895, a handbook into which is skilfully condensed the substance of four hundred years' history; Mathews' *A History of New Testament Times in Palestine*, 1899, a vigorous, able, and pithy presentation of the salient facts and features of Judaism between the dates 175 B.C. and 70 A.D.; and *Judea from Cyrus to Titus*, 507 B.C. to 70 A.D., by Elizabeth W. Latimer, a vivid, popular narrative of the political, religious, and social experiences of the Jewish nation during this long period. To this list should be added Canon Farrar's popular work on the Herods.

Editions of Apocryphal Books:—

Book of Enoch, Charles, 1893.

Book of Wisdom, Deane, 1881.

Psalms of Solomon, Ryle and James, 1891.

Apocalypse of Baruch, Charles, 1896.

Assumption of Moses, Charles, 1897.

Book of Jubilees, Charles, 1895.

Fourth Esdras, Bensly & James, 1895.

Sibylline Oracles, Alexandre, 1869, or Friedlieb, 1850.

BOOKS OF REFERENCE

POLITICS AND LITERATURE

Abbreviations.

- MRP Mommsen — The Provinces of the Roman Empire, Vol. II., 1886.
- MtRS Marquardt — Römische Staatsverwaltung, Vol. I., 1881.
- SchJPTC Schürer — Jewish People in the Time of Christ, 1890. Div. I., Vol. II.; Div. II., Vol. III.
- HePJ Herriot — Philon le Juif, 1898.
- StAM Streane — The Age of the Maccabees, 1898.
- DP Derenbourg — Essai sur l'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine.
- MCJ Madden — Coins of the Jews, 1881.
- Introductions to various apocryphal books, see Appendix VI.

HISTORY

- EwHI Ewald — History of Israel (Eng. transl.).
- RePI Renan — History of the People of Israel, IV., V., 1896.
- GrGJ Graetz — Geschichte der Juden, II., III.
- HmGVI Holtzmann — Geschichte des Volkes Israel, II. (Stade), 1888.
- CornHPI Cornill — History of the People of Israel, 1898.
- MorJR Morrison — The Jews under the Romans, 1890.
- MHR Mommsen — History of Rome (Eng. transl.), 1889.
- HNZ Holtzmann — Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 1895.

Abbreviations.

- SchJPTC . . . Schürer — Jewish People in the Time of
Christ, Div. I., Vols. I., II., 1890.
MilHJ . . . Milman — History of the Jews, I., II.

RELIGION

- SchJPTC . . . Schürer — The Jewish People in the Time of
Christ, Div. II., Vols. II., III., 1890.
ToyJC . . . Toy — Judaism and Christianity, 1892.
KeimJN . . . Keim — Jesus of Nazara, Vol. I. (Eng.
transl.).
HrNT . . . Hausrath — New Testament Times, Vol. I.,
1880.
ChE . . . Charles — Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish,
and Christian, 1899.
HaB . . . Hastings — Bible Dictionary, 1898.

REFERENCES

PART I.—THE MACCABEAN PERIOD OF JEWISH HISTORY

I

THE HISTORICAL SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD

I. Maccabees; II. Maccabees; Jewish War, I. 1-6; Antiquities, Books XII., XIII.; Daniel; Enoch, XXXVII.-LXXII., LXXXIII.-XC.; Book of Wisdom; Sibylline Oracles, Book III.; SchJPTC Div. II., III. 6-13, 49-54, 55-73, 211-215, 271-288; Div. I., I. 77-99, 111-114; StAM 143-156, 187-196, 218-221, 222-225, Appendix C.; RePI IV. 297-313; V. 20-26; HmGVI II. 322-333, 410-436.

II

THE CAUSES AND OCCASION OF THE MACCABEAN UPRISING

EwHI V. 286-300; GrGJ II. 292-321; SchJPTC I., I. 186-212; CornHPI 175-193; RePI IV. 259-276, 289-296; MorJR 1-7; MilHJ I. 502-509; HmGVI II. 311-322, 334-335; DP 41-69.

III

THE SUCCESSFUL STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

GrGJ II. 322-364; CornHPI 193-197; EwHI V. 306-318; SchJPTC I., I. 213-224; RePI IV. 314-329; MorJR 8-9; MilHJ II. 9-19; HmGVI II. 335-343.

IV

THE LONG CONTEST FOR POLITICAL FREEDOM

EwHI V. 319-326; GrGJ III. 1-14; SchJPTC I., I. 225-239; CornHPI 197-201; RePI IV. 329-345; MilHJ II. 20-24; HmGVI II. 343, 359-363.

V

THE ATTAINMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

EwHI V. 327-334; GrGJ III. 15-26, 55-58; SchJPTC I., I. 240-257; CornHPI 201-205; RePI IV. 345-V. 4; MilHJ II. 25-27; HmGVI II. 364-375.

VI

JUDAISM IN SYRIA AND EGYPT

GrGJ III. 26-54; RePI IV. 208-219, V. 67-86; MilHJ II. 32-35; HmGVI II. 344-346; EwHI V. 354-358; HePJ 54-105; SchJPTC II., II. 225-230, II., III. 230-243; ChE 252-260.

VII

THE HAPPY DAYS OF SIMON'S REIGN

SchJPTC I., I. 258-271; EwHI V. 335-342; GrGJ III. 55-70; CornHPI 205-208; RePI V. 5-12; MilHJ II. 28-29; HmGVI II. 375-385; MCJ 61-73.

VIII

HISTORICAL EXPANSION UNDER JOHN HYRCANUS

SchJPTC I., I. 273-290; EwHI V. 342-354; GrGJ III. 71-86; CornHPI 209-211; RePI V. 27-36; MilHJ II. 30-31; HmGVI II. 385-394; MCJ 74-83; DP 70-82.

IX

INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND THE GROWTH OF PARTIES

GrGJ III. 87-110; SchJPTC I., I. 291-312; EwHI V. 359-376; CornHPI 212-215; RePI V. 37-57; MilHJ II. 37-42; HmGVI II. 394-397; SchJPTC II., II. 4-43; HrNT I. 135-169; KeimJN I. 329-393; MorJR 296-322, 323-347; MCJ 83-91; DP 95-144.

X

THE REVIVAL OF HELLENISM AND THE STRUGGLE OF
PARTIES

HmGVI II. 400-410; CornHPI 215-219; EwHI V. 385-392;
GrGJ III. 131-166; RePI V. 93-121; MilHJ II. 44-49.

XI

FATAL DISSENSIONS AND THE COMING OF THE ROMANS

EwHI V. 395-402; GrGJ III. 167-181; SchJPTC I., I. 313-325; CornHPI 219-225; RePI V. 122-136; MilHJ II. 50-56;
HmGVI II. 437-442; MHR IV. 163-170.

PART II.—THE ROMAN PERIOD OF JEWISH
HISTORY

I

THE HISTORICAL SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD

Antiquities, Books, XIV.-XX.; Jewish War, Book I. 8-Book VII.; Against Apion; The Gospels and the Acts; Plutarch; Suetonius; Dio Cassius, XXXVII.-LIV.; Appian, BK XI.; Tacitus, BK V. 1-13; Psalms of Solomon; Assumption of Moses; Book of Jubilees; SchJPTC Div. II., III. 17-22, 73-80, 134-139, 321-381, 83-91, 93-108; StAM 204-212, 225-227, 227-228, 228-234; ChE 245-249, 249-251, 269-297; RePI V. 185-188.

II

THE TROUBLOUS TIMES OF HYRCANUS II

SchJPTC I., I. 371-391; EwHI V. 394-412; GrGJ III. 167-189; RePI V. 163-175; MorJR 41-57; CornHPI 225-230; MilHJ II. 59-64; HmGVI II. 456-460; MCJ 92-96.

III

THE LAST OF THE HASMONEANS

EwHI V. 411-416; GrGJ III. 190-206; RePI V. 176-184;
CornHPI 230-232; MilHJ II. 63-68; HmGVI II. 467-476;
MRP II. 174-178; MtRS I. 406-407.

IV

HEROD THE KING OF THE JEWS

EwHI V. 413-428; HmGVI II. 469-481; GrGJ III. 204-234;
RePI V. 212-226; MilHJ II. 65-77; MorJR 58-75; MRP II.
177-178; MtRS 407-408; HrNJ I. 216-270; KeimJN I. 233-
241; MCJ 105-114; HaB II. 355-357; HNZ 74-77.

V

HEROD UNDER AUGUSTUS

EwHI V. 429-440; CornHPI 234-237; HmGVI II. 491-494;
GrGJ III. 235-246; RePI V. 227-250; MilHJ II. 77-86; MorJR
76-83; MRP II. 179-182; HrNT II. 3-29; KeimJN I. 241-248.

VI

IN THE DAYS OF HEROD THE KING

EwHI V. 441-449; HmGVI II. 495-505; GrGJ III. 246-261;
RePI V. 251-260; MilHJ II. 87-97; MorJR 85-91; DP 145-
165; MRP II. 182-183; HrNT II. 29-52; KeimJN I. 248-254.

VII

THE INNER LIFE OF THE NATION

SchJPTC II., I. 207-305, 306-377; II., II. 44-83, 90-125, 126-
187; KeimJN I. 296-328; MorJR 240-252, 273-295, 362-374;
DP 176-192; RePI V. 269-278; ChE 162-199, 200-268, 269-305;
HrNT I. 84-118; ToyJC 246-248, 258-266, 319-331; HNZ 147-
157, 208-211.

VIII

HEROD'S SONS AND KING AGRIPPA

SchJPTC I., II. 10-165; MorJR 92-118; GrGJ III. 262-272, 339-389; RePI V. 261-268; CornHPI 241-246, 254, 257, 253-258; MilHJ II. 99-112, 133-139, 164-169; DP 205-219; KeimJN I. 253-275; HmGVI II. 506-521; MRP II. 183-184, 200-201; HrNT II. 61-72; HNz 78-79, 81-82; MCJ 114-139.

IX

IN THE HANDS OF ROME

HrNT II. 72-93; MRP II. 184-191, 194-200; MtRS 411-412; HmGVI II. 506-513, 628-645; MilHJ II. 125-131, 170-186; CornHPI 246-252, 259-271; GrGJ III. 388-389, 461-472; MorJR 119-152; DP 230, 247-261; SchJPTC I., II. 39-87; HNz 79, 83-86; MCJ 173-187.

X

THE FINAL CATASTROPHE

MorJR 153-180; SchJPTC I., II. 207-256; HNz 85-87; GrGJ III. 505-578; CornHPI 272-301; DP 262-301; MilHJ II. 248-390; HmGVI II. 645-657, 664-674; MRP II. 205-220; MCJ 188-206.


XI

GLIMPSES OF JUDAISM IN PALESTINE AFTER THE WAR AND OF
JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION

MorJR 181-206, 375-415; RePI V. 189-205; HmGVI II. 460-462; MRP II. 162-170; RePI V. 279-326; SchJPTC I., II. 257-321; MilHJ II. 391-497; MRP II. 192, 220-225, 230; SchJPTC II., II. 219-327; HtPJ 107-135; DP 366-438; MCJ 207-253.

INDEXES

Y



INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

ABTALION, 177, 181.

Agrippa I., 241; his career, 242; aids Claudius, 243; his influence, 243; his territory increased, 243; his persecution of the Christian church, 244; death of, 245.

Agrippa II., 257; his policy, 258; as mediator, 262.

Albinus, 257, 258.

Alcimus as high-priest, 45, 47; treachery of, 46; defaces the temple, 55.

Alexander, procurator, 254.

Alexander, son of Aristobulus, attempts to seize throne, 157; second attempt and defeat, 158.

Alexander, son of Herod, killed, 210.

Alexander Balas, 58; marries Cleopatra, 60; defeated at Antioch, 61; death, 62.

Alexander Jannæus, made king, 119; besieges Ptolemais and Gaza, 119; defeat at Asphon, 120; alliance with Cleopatra, 121; offends the Pharisees, 122; conquests of Gadara, Amathus, Raphia, and Anthedon, 121; his vengeance, 121, 124; his struggles against Pharisees, 123; defeat at Shechem, 123; war with Antiochus XII., 124; defeat at Adida, 124; three years of conquests beyond Jordan, 125; death and funeral, 125; character of his reign, 125.

Alexander of Macedonia, character of, 14.

Alexander Zabinas, 100.

Alexandra, wife of Jannæus, supports Pharisees, 122; her accession, 127; notable facts of her reign, 128; appeal of Sadducees to, 129; propitiates Tigranes, 130; death, 130; benefits of her reign, 130.

Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, 182; appeals to Antony, 182; prisoner at Jerusalem, 183; plots against Herod, 184, 189; death of, 190.

Alexandria, Judaism in, 10; Jews in, 75-77; Jewish literature of, 78, 86; persecution of Jews in, 242, 243, 284.

Ambivius, procurator, 250.

Ananel, made high-priest, 181; deposed, 182.

Ananias, murdered, 263.

Antigonus, brother of Aristobulus, murdered, 118.

Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, 168; effort to seize throne, 170; defeat at Jerusalem and death, 177.

Antioch, 72, 73.

Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes), 18; his Hellenism, 18; in Egypt, 20; opposition to Judaism, 21; persecutions under, 22, 23, 24; plan of extermination of Jews, 31; death of, 39.

Antiochus V., Lysias guardian of, 39.

Antiochus VI., 63; supported by Jonathan, 64.

Antiochus VII. (Sidetes), drives out Tryphon, 94; besieges Jerusalem, 98; death of, 100.

Antiochus VIII., 100, 101.

- Antiochus IX., 101, 103.
 Antipas, see Herod Antipas.
 Antipater, plots against Herod, 210; sent to Rome, 211; trial and death, 212.
 Antipater of Idumea, made governor, 131; supports Hyrcanus, 131; compact with Aretas, 131; 156, 158, 160, 161; aids Mithridates at Pelusium, 162; aids Caesar, 162; at Memphis, 162; his reward, 163; his increasing power, 164; death, character, and influence of, 167.
 Antipater, son of Herod, 205, 206, 207.
 Antony, ruler of Syria, 168; in Egypt, 173; in Tyre, 173; aids Herod, 173; in Laodicea, 184; death of, 186.
 Apocalypse of Baruch, 153.
 Apollonius, at Jerusalem, 21.
 Archelaus of Cappadocia, his daughter marries Alexander, 204; saves Alexander from death, 207.
 Archelaus, son of Herod, made king, 232; his policy, 233-234; goes to Rome, 234; made ethnarch, 235; his reign, 235; deposed, 235.
 Aretas, battle with Antiochus XII., 124; made governor of Damascus, 124; withdraws from Judea, 125; defeats Aristobulus, 132.
 Aristobulus, 80; his writings, 81.
 Aristobulus, son of Herod I., 204; killed, 210.
 Aristobulus I., son of Hyrcanus, made high-priest, 117; takes title of king, 118; encourages Hellenism, 118; murder of Antigonus, 119.
 Aristobulus II., 127; attempt to seize the kingdom, 130; defeat by Aretas, 132; relieved by Scaurus, 133; alliance with Pompey, 134; thrown into prison, 134; escape and return to Rome, 158.
 Aristobulus III., Herod's brother-in-law, made high-priest, 182; death of, 180.
 Assumption of Moses, 151, 229.
 Athronges, proclaims himself king in Judea, 234.
 Augustus, defeats Antony, 186; compact with Herod, 187; his policy, 192; confirms Herod's will, 235; deposes Herod Antipas, 235; arrangement of provinces by, 246, 247.
 BACCHIDES, treachery of, 46; campaign against Judas, 54, 55.
 Balas, see Alexander Balas.
 Bar-Cochba, 281.
 Berenice, palace burned, 263.
 Berytus, council of, 209.
 Beth-horon, Seron defeated at, 30; rout of Romans at, 264.
 Bethsaida, Julius, 241.
 Bethsur, defeat of Lysias at, 33; fortified by Judas, 35.
 Boethusim, 196.
 Book of Enoch, 228, 229.
 Book of Jubilees, 152, 222, 229.
 Book of Wisdom, 81, 82, 83, 84, 230.
 CÆSAR, Julius, 159, 160; aids Cleopatra, 162; relations to Antipater, 162; reorganization of Judea by, 163; death of, 166; mourned by the Jews, 163.
 Caesar, Sextus, 164, 165.
 Casarea, harbor built by Herod, 198, 199.
 Casarea Philippi, built by Philip, 241.
 Caligula, Caius, makes Agrippa king, 242; his statue in temple, 243; assassinated, 243, 284.
 Canon of Old Testament, 8, 23 (see Appendix V.).
 Cassius, in Syria, 159; defeats Jews at Tarichæa, 159; governor of Syria, 166; his taxation of Jews, 167; defeat at Philippi, 168.
 Census, by Quirinius, 248.
 Cestius Gallus, 264; advance on Jerusalem, 264; routed at Beth-horon, 264.
 Chasidim, see Hasideans.
 Citadel, at Jerusalem, 22; built up by Syrians, 22; attacked by Judas, 40; besieged by Jonathan, 62; cut off by wall, 67; besieged by Simon, 69; fall of, 88.

- Claudius, Emperor, 253; death of, 256.
 Cleopatra, protects Jews from Pompey, 120; alliance with Jannæus, 121; exiled to Syria, 161; 185.
 Coele-Syria, Herod made governor of, 165.
 Coponius, procurator, 249.
 Crassus, consul in Syria, 159; pillage of temple treasures, 159.
 Cumanus, procurator, 254; banished, 255.
 Cuspius Fadus, procurator, 249.
- DANIEL, Book of, 7, 8, 9.
 Dedication, Feast of, 34, 35.
 Demetrius I., declared king, 46; death of, 60.
 Demetrius II., 62; treaties with Jonathan, 62, 63; defeated by Tryphon, 64; treaty with Simon, 71; restores Jewish independence, 71; expedition in the East, 93; capture of, 94.
 Demetrius Eucærus, governor of Damascus, 123; defeat by Jannæus at Shechem, 123.
 Dio Cassius, 281.
 Diodatus (Tryphon), 63; declared king, 70.
 Dispersion, 284, 285, 286.
- EGYPT, temple in, 74, 75, 76.
 Eleazar, brother of Judas, 29.
 Eleazar, the Zealot, 262; leader of the party, 272; murdered, 273.
 Emmaus, encampment of Syrians at, 31; battle near, 32.
 Emperor, first Roman, 191; sacrifice for, ceases, 262.
 Enoch, Book of, date, 9; visions of, 42.
 Essenes, meaning of name, 111; their laws and theology, 112; origin of customs and teachings, 113; their influence, 114.
 Eurycles, plot against Herod, 209.
 Ezra, Fourth Book of, 153.
- FADUS, procurator, 253.
 Felix, procurator, 255.
 Festus, procurator, 256; death of, 257.
- Florus, Gessius, 258; his policy, 260; attacks Jerusalem, 261; surrenders to Titus, 276.
- GABINIUS, 157.
 Galba, Emperor, 269.
 Galilee, Simon rescues Jews in, 36; Judaized by Aristobulus, 118; Herod governor of, 164; Herod's campaigns in, 175; war in, 267.
 Gamala, 268.
 Gamara, 147, 223.
 "Genesis, Little," 152.
 Gerizim, destruction of temple on, 102.
 Gischala, 269.
 Gorgias, defeat at Emmaus, 32; victory at Jamnia, 36.
 Græco-Jewish literature, 78, 79; philosophy of, 79.
 Gratus, procurator, 249.
- HADRIAN, 280.
 Haggada, 222.
 Halacha, 221, 222.
 Hasideans, 27; 46, 47; their ideals, 106.
 Hasmoneans, origin of, 29; 69, 97, 155, 165, 168.
 Heliopolis, temple built in, 74.
 Hellenism, in Palestine, 15; influence of, 16; in Antioch, 72; in Alexandria, 73.
 Herod I. (the Great), 164; governor of Galilee, 164; summoned before the Sanhedrin, 165; governor of Coele-Syria, 165; attacks Jerusalem, 165; favors Romans, 167; flees to Masada, 172; in Egypt, 173; aided by Antony and Octavian, 173, 174; King of Judea, 174; attacks Jerusalem, 175; campaigns in Galilee, 175; marries Mariamne, 176; his rule at Jerusalem, 179-180; summoned before Antony, 183; renounces Antony, 186; supports Octavian, 187; destroys Hyrcanus, 187; executes Mariamne, 189; executes Alexandra, 190; under Augustus, 192; inno-

- vations at Jerusalem, 193; his benevolence, 195; his ambitions, 196; his buildings, 197; his harbor at Casarea, 198; his Hellenistic policy, 199; builds temple, 200; his sons, 203, 204; meets Agrippa, 204; in Asia Minor, 205; his sons' plot, 206, 207; invades Arabia, 208; subdues rebellion in Trachonitis, 208; trouble with Augustus, 208; kills his two sons, 208; sends Antipater to Rome, 211; his "slaughter of the innocents," 214; his will, 232.
- Herod Agrippa I., see Agrippa I.
 Herod Agrippa II., see Agrippa II.
 Herod Antipas, son of Herod, 232; his character, 236; his extravagance, 237; his buildings, 237; marries Herodias, 238; defeated by Aretas, 239; goes to Rome, 239; banished, 240.
 Herod of Chalcis, 253.
 Herodias, 238; secures death of John the Baptist, 238.
 Hillel, 234.
 Hyrcanus I. (John), 89, 97; besieged at Jerusalem, 98; his policy, 101; captures Marissa and Adora, 102; subdues Idumea, 102; his coinage, 103; captures Samaria, 103; joins Sadducees, 115; his death, 116; his prosperous reign, 117; leaves government to his wife, 117.
 Hyrcanus II., son of Jannæus, made high-priest, 127; becomes king, 131; deposed by Aristobulus, 131; reinstated in priesthood, 144; rewarded by Cæsar, 163; taken prisoner by Pacorus, 171; mutilated, 172; return to Jerusalem, 182; death of, 187.
- IDUMEA, subdued by Hyrcanus, 101.
 Idumeans, come to Jerusalem, 271.
- JAMES, the brother of Christ, 257.
 Jamnia, centre of Judaism, 279.
 Jason, high-priest, 18; exile of, 19; return, second exile, and death, 20.
- Jerusalem, besieged by Lysias, 43; walls restored, 67; fall of citadel, 88; besieged by Sidetes, 98; surrender, 99; besieged and taken by Herod, 177; attacked by Agrippa, 261; disturbances in, 263; civil war in, 270; three parties in, 272; taken and destroyed by Titus, 276.
- Jewish independence, 71.
 Jewish schools, 217, 221, 223.
 Jewish writings, value of, 148.
- Jews, in Egypt, 75, 77; in Palestine, 76; given religious freedom under Cæsar, 163; persecutions of in Egypt, 242, 243; rebellion of, 260, 262; seize Masada and Antonia, 262.
- Jesus, the Christ, 213, 229, 230.
 Jesus, son of Gamaliel, 217.
- Joazar, high-priest, 248.
- John Hyrcanus, see Hyrcanus I.
 John of Gischala, 266; flees to Jerusalem, 269; 270, 271, 272; escapes from Jerusalem, 275; captive at Rome, 269.
- John the Baptist, death of, 238.
- Jonathan, 29; chosen leader, 53; appointed high-priest, 59; alliance with Bacchides, 56; selects Michmash as capital, 57; honored by Alexander, 60; defeats Apollonius, 61; treaties with Demetrius II., 62, 63; besieges citadel, 62; aids Antiochus, 64; treaty with Rome and Sparta, 66; drives out Demetrius, 66; made prisoner, 68; death, 69.
- Joppa, harbor opened, 89; 198.
- Joseph, brother of Herod, at Masada, 172; death of, 176.
- Josephus, "Antiquities" of, 144, 145; value of his history, 144; his "Jewish War," 145, 216; leader in Galilee, 265, 266, 267; his army dispersed, 267; at Jotapata, 267; surrenders to the Romans, 268; his prophecy, 268, 270; given freedom, 271; messenger to Titus, 274, 275.
- Jotapata, 266, 267.
- Judas, of Galilee, seizes Sepphoris, 234; leads the Zealots, 249; killed, 249.

- Judas Maccabeus, leader, 29; his policy, 30; victory at Emmaus, 32; at Bethsur, 33; restores the temple, 34, 35; campaigns in Idumea and beyond Jordan, 36, 38; at Ephron, 37; attempt to reduce citadel, 40; defeat at Bethzechariah, 42; victory at Adasa, 49; treaty with Rome, 51; defeat and death at Eleasa, 52; burial at Modein, 53; his character, 53.
- Judah ben Zabbai, 127.
- Judaism, in Palestine, 10; in Alexandria, 10, 230; independence established, 104; its humiliation, 149; "Golden Age" of, 244; after the war, 280; last struggle for independence, 281; of the Dispersion, 282, 283, 284.
- Judea, independence established, 104; made tributary to Rome, 135; reorganization under Cæsar, 163; Augustan age of, 193; under Roman government, 246, 247; census in, 248; after the war, 279.
- "KING of the Jews," birth of, 213.
- LEONTOPOLIS, temple built in, 74.
- Lights, Feast of, 35.
- Logos, Philo's conception of, 283.
- Lysias, defeat at Bethsur, 33; rivalry with Philip, 39, 40; besieges Jerusalem, 43; compromises with the Jews, 44.
- MACCABEAN leaders, their relations with Pharisees and Sadducees, 114.
- Maccabean Period, date of, 3; stages in, 4.
- Maccabees, the meaning of name, 29.
- Maccabees I., book, period covered by, and date, 4; compared with Maccabees II., 5.
- Maccabees II., book, period covered by, 5; general character and date, 5.
- Macharus, 175, 238.
- Malichus, 167, 168.
- Marianne, marries Herod I., 176; 184, 188; death of, 189.
- Masada, 172, 175.
- Mattathias, begins war, 3; at Modein, 24; his defiance, 25; as leader, 26; death of, 28.
- Menahem, 263.
- Menelaus, 19.
- Messiah, prophecies of, 211, 228, 229.
- Messianic hope, influence of, 228; literary form of, 152, 228, 229, 230; Pharisees' conception of, 108; of the Zealots, 249.
- Michmash, chosen as capital, 57.
- Mishna, 147, 222, 223.
- Mithridates, 132, 162.
- Mizpah, assembly at, 31.
- Modein, 24; Mattathias, buried at, 28; Judas buried at, 53; Maccabean monument at, 69.
- NEAPOLITANUS, 261.
- Nero, Emperor, 256, 265; death of, 269.
- Nerva, 286.
- New Testament, 145, 146; taxation noted in, 249.
- Nicanor, 48; love for Judas, 48, 49; defeat and death at Adasa, 49; "Nicanor's day," 49.
- Nicholas of Damascus, 199, 208, 235.
- OEEDAS II., death of, 208.
- Onias III., fate of, 19.
- Onias IV., of Alexandria, 73, 74; builds temple in Heliopolis, 74; his temple closed, 279.
- Orodes, invades Syria, 170.
- PALESTINE, under Herod I., 203; after the war, 280.
- Parthia, 170.
- Parthians, in Palestine, 169; 174; attack Syria, 175.
- Phannias, high-priest, 270.
- Pharisees, first appear, 106; their spirit, doctrines, and influence, 107; their conception of future life, 108; of the Messianic state, 108; struggle with Sadducees, 111; supported by Alexandria, 122; stir up rebellion

- against Jannæus, 123; restore ceremonial observance, 128; revenge upon Sadducees, 129; "Golden age" of Phariseism, 130; retire from national councils, 131; end of first stage of conflict with Sadducees, 133; refuse allegiance to Herod, 181; promise Judean throne to Pheroras, 210; in the Sanhedrin, 250; after the war, 278.
- Phasaël, 166; subdues insurrection, 168; tetrarch of Judea, 169; taken prisoner by Pacorus, 171; death of, 173.
- Pheroras, 207, 210; death of, 211.
- Philip, appointed regent, 39.
- Philip, son of Herod, 232; his reign, 240; coinage, 240; builds Cæsarea Philippi, 241; death of, 241.
- Philo Judæus, 80; his teachings, 82; his hope, 230; 232; his influence, 283; sent to Rome, 284.
- Pompey, 132; his generals in Syria, 132; besieges Jerusalem, 133; takes temple mount, 135; sacrilege of Holy of Holies, 135; humanity to Jews, 154; value of his conquests, 155; policy in Palestine, 155; defeat at Pharsalia, 161.
- Pontius Pilate, procurator, 251; offends Jews, 251; dismissed, 252.
- Porcius Festus, procurator, 256; death of, 257.
- Procurators, residence in Palestine, 247; system of duties of, 247; checks upon authority of, 247.
- Provinces, Roman, arrangement of by Augustus, 246; governors for, 247; Judea's rank among, 247.
- Psalms, Maccabean, see Appendix V.
- Psalms of Solomon, 136; their pharisaic origin, 136; their theology, 137; their doctrine of a future state, 139, 156, 157; Messianic prophecies in, 229.
- Ptolmeus, 199.
- Ptolemy Lathurus, 120; treaty with Jannæus, 120; victory at Asphon, 120; retires to Cyprus, 121.
- Ptolemy Philometor, 61.
- Ptolemy, son-in-law of Simon, betrays Simon, 95; disappears, 98.
- QUIRINIUS, legate of Syria, 248; takes census in Judea, 248.
- RABBI AKIBA, 281.
- Rabbinism, 220, 221, 278.
- Rabbinical literature, 146, 147.
- Rome, watchfulness of Syria, 50; influence in Judea, 99; civil wars in, 160; under Augustus, 191.
- SABINUS, procurator, 233; robs treasury, 234.
- Sadducees, their philosophy and faith, 109; their doctrine of free will, 110; struggle with Pharisees, 111; persecution by Pharisees, 129; appeal to Alexander, 129; end of strife with Pharisees, 133; as priests, 227; in Sanhedrin, 181, 250.
- Salome, 184; plot against Herod, 189; 207, 208, 209, 210, 232.
- Samaria, 252, 255.
- Sameas, 165, 166.
- Sanhedrin, 165; loses power, 166; revival of power, 250; after the war, 279.
- Scaurus, aids Aristobulus, 132, 133.
- Scribes, their work and influence, 221; place and power, 223, 224; their different types, 224; effect of their teaching, 225; in the Sanhedrin, 250, 251.
- Septuagint, 77.
- Seron, battle with, 30.
- Shechem, 123.
- Shemaia, 165, 177; favors Herod, 181.
- Sibylline Oracles, number and use of, 12; date of, 12; character of, 12, 85, 86.
- Sicarii, 255, 257, 263.
- Silo, 175.
- Simon, chosen chief, 29, campaign in Galilee, 36; made military commander, 64; made leader, 68; supports Demetrius II, 71; his leadership, 87; takes Gazara, 87; takes Bethsur, 88; takes citadel at

- Jerusalem, 88; benefits of his reign, 89, 90; chosen governor, chief, and high-priest, 91; embassy to Rome, 91; his coinage, 92, 93; compact with Antiochus, 94; defeats Sidetes, 95; death of, 95.
- Sparta, treaty with, 66.
- Syllæus, plots against Herod, 208.
- Synagogue, 218; origin, purpose, and influence, 219, 220; its services, 225; after the war, 232.
- TALMUDS, 147.
- Targums, 148.
- Tarichæa, 159, 268.
- Taxes, under Cassius, 167; under Augustus, 248.
- Temple, desecration of, 22; cleansed and re-dedicated by Judas, 34; pillaged by Crassus, 159; rebuilt by Herod, 201; destroyed by Titus, 275.
- Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs, 153.
- Tetrarch, see Herod Antipas, and Philip.
- Theudas, the Pretender, 256.
- Tiberias, surrenders to Vespasian, 268.
- Tiberius Alexander, procurator, 254.
- Tiberius, supports Herod Antipas, 236; death of, 239; 284.
- Tigranes, 130.
- Titus, 268; takes Tarichæa, 268; besieges Jerusalem, 273; destroys Temple, 275; triumph at Rome, 276.
- Trachonitis, 208.
- Trajan, 286.
- Tryphon, driven out by Antiochus Sidetes, 94.
- VARUS, 234.
- Vespasian, 265; invades Galilee, 267; takes Tiberias, 268; surrender of Josephus to, 268; goes to Italy, 269; made emperor, 272.
- Vitellius, 239; seeks to avenge Antipas, 239.
- WISDOM OF SOLOMON, date and character of, 11, 82, 83, 84.
- ZADOK, the house of, 109.
- Zealots, 248, 255, 257, 263, 266, 270, 271, 272.
- Zeus, altar to, 22.

INDEX OF REFERENCES

TO

BIBLICAL AND EXTRA-BIBLICAL SOURCES

ANNALS.		Page			Page			Page
i. 2	192	xiv. 2-3	133	xvii. 3, 1, 2	211
ANTIGUITIES OF JOSEPHUS.			xiv. 3, 2	133	xvii. 4, 1, 3	211
BOOK.			xiv. 3, 3, 4	134	xvii. 5, 1, 8	212
xii. 5, 1	19	xiv. 5, 2, 4	157	xvii. 5, 7, 1	212
xii. 5, 4	22	xiv. 5, 4	158	xvii. 6, 1, 4	213
xii. 9, 7	22	xiv. 6, 2, 3	158	xvii. 7, 1, 2	240
xii. 5, 4	23	xiv. 8, 1, 2	162	xvii. 9, 1, 3	233
xii. 6, 2	24	xiv. 8, 3	163	xvii. 10, 1, 2, 4, 10	234
xii. 6, 1	25	xiv. 10, 22	100	xvii. 11, 1, 5	235
xii. 7, 1	30	xiv. 10, 2	163	xvii. 13, 1, 5	236
xii. 7, 6	34	xiv. 10, 1, 8, 20, 24	163	xvii. 11, 2	246
xii. 8, 3	37	xiv. 11, 2	167	xviii. 2-3	237
xii. 8, 6	38	xiv. 13, 7, 9	172	xviii. 3, 5	284
xii. 9, 1	39	xiv. 14, 4	174	xviii. 5, 2	238
xii. 9, 3	40	xiv. 1-5	174	xviii. 6, 10	239
xii. 9, 3	41	xiv. 10, 6, 13, 14, 18	284	xviii. 4, 6, 10	241
xii. 9, 7	44, 45	xiv. 15, 4, 5	175	xviii. 6, 1, 10	242
xii. 11, 2	46	xiv. 15, 7, 9, 11, 12	176	xviii. 7, 2	242
xii. 10, 2	47	xiv. 16, 2	177	xviii. 8, 2	243
xii. 10, 3	47	xv. 1, 1	177	xviii. 8, 7, 8	243
xiii. 1, 2	54	xv. 2, 1, 5	182	xviii. 1, 1	248
xiii. 6, 7	71	xv. 3, 2, 4	183	xviii. 1, 1, 6	249
xiii. 3, 4	75	xv. 3, 8, 9	184	xviii. 1, 1	249
xiii. 3, 1	76	xv. 5, 1, 5	186	xviii. 1, 4	250
xiii. 6, 7	88	xv. 6-7	186	xviii. 1, 6	251
xiii. 6, 7	88	xv. 7, 2, 6	189	xviii. 3, 1	251
xiii. 8, 2, 3	99	xv. 7, 9, 10	190	xviii. 3, 2	252
xiii. 9, 2	99	xv. 7, 1, 4	194	xx. 1, 1, 3	253
xiii. 8, 4	101	xv. 8, 4	194	xx. 4, 1, 5	244
xiii. 9, 3	101	xv. 8, 5	194	xx. 5, 1	244
xiii. 10, 1	101	xv. 10, 4	195	xx. 5, 3	254
xiii. 9, 1	102	xv. 9, 1, 2, 4	196	xx. 5, 4	255
xiii. 10, 2, 3	103	xv. 9, 6	199	xx. 5, 8	256
xiii. 5, 9	106	xv. 11, 2, 6	201	xx. 6, 1, 3	255
xiii. 5, 9	110	xv. 11, 3, 5, 7	201	xx. 7, 1	255
xiii. 5, 9	107	xv. 15, 1	174	xx. 8, 6	256
xiii. 10, 5, 6	114	xvi. 1-2	204	xx. 9, 4	258
xiii. 10, 7	116	xvi. 2, 2, 5	205	xx. 9, 6-7	258
xiii. 11, 3	118	xvi. 3, 1, 3	206	xx. 9, 2	258
xiii. 12, 2, 6	120	xvi. 4, 1, 4	206			
xiii. 13, 2, 3	121	xvi. 5, 1, 3	197	BOOK OF ENOCH.		
xiii. 13, 5	123	xvi. 7, 2	207	xxxiii., xxxiv.	42
xiii. 14, 2	124	xvi. 7, 8	207	lxxxiii., xc.	42
xiii. 15, 5	125-127	xvi. 8, 2	209	lxxxv., xc.	42
xiii. 16, 2, 3	129	xvi. 10, 1	209	xc. 15, 39	42
xiii. 16, 4	130	xvi. 11, 1, 7	210	xc. 13	200
xiv. 2-1, 2	132	xvii. 1, 1	210	lxxxiii., xc.	228
			xvii. 2, 4	211			

INDEX OF REFERENCES

319

	Page		Page		Page
BOOK OF WISDOM.		ii. 21, 3, 6	266	iv. 37, 40	34
i. 1, 12	82	ii. 21, 7	267	iv. 42, 46	34
i. 7	83	iii. 6, 2, 3	267	v. 47, 59	35
iii. 7, 8	230	iii. 7, 8	268	v. 1, 7	36
iii. 652, 794	230	iii. 9, 7-8	268	v. 9	36
vi. 12	82	iii. 10, 1, 10	268	v. 9, 54	37
vii. 25, 27	82	iv. 1, 17	269	v. 62, 63	37
vii. 26	83	iv. 1, 8	269	v. 68	38
vii. 24	83	iv. 2, 2, 5	269	vi. 1, 15	39
vii. 22	83	iv. 9, 2	270	vi. 17	39
viii. 20	84	iv. 10, 3, 7	270	vi. 18	40
ix. 18	24	iv. 3, 1, 12	270	vi. 28, 31	41
ix. 1, 2	83	iv. 4, 5, 1	271	vi. 32, 41	41
ix. 15	84	iv. 5, 5-6	271	vi. 66	43
ix. 18	82	iv. 6, 1, 3	272	vii. 1-2	46
xi. 5	82	v. 1, 6	201	vii. 8, 13	47
xi. 17	83	v. 4	88	vii. 19-20	47
xi. 24-26	84	v. 1, 2, 5	273	vii. 21, 25	48
xii. 1	83	v. 3, 1	273	vii. 26	48
		v. 7, 2, 3	274	vii. 27, 35	49
CONTRA APION.		v. 8, 1, 12	274	viii. 17-18	51
i. 12	216	v. 9, 1, 14	274	viii. 31-32	52
		v. 12, 1-2	274	ix. 6	52
DE EXECRAT.		vi. 2, 4	251	ix. 17-18	52
sect. 89	230	vi. 1, 7, 8	275	ix. 19-20	53
		vi. 1, 1-2	275	ix. 25-26	52
DE PREM. ET PROEM.		vi. 2, 1	275	ix. 28, 31	53
sect. 15, 20	230	vi. 3, 1-2	275	ix. 33, 49	54
		vi. 4, 1, 7	275	ix. 58, 72	57
DIO CASSIUS.		vi. 8, 1, 5	276	ix. 73	57
xlviii. 4	219	vii. 10, 3	74	x. 3, 13	59
lix. 14	281	vii. 8, 9	276	x. 15, 21	59
				x. 22, 50	60
JEWISH WAR.		JOSEPHUS.		xi. 1, 19	62
BOOK.		xv., xvii.	199	xi. 22, 28	62
i. 3, 5	112			xi. 34	63
i. 36	112	KEIM, JESUS OF NAZARA.		xi. 38, 40	63
i. 5, 2	127	i.	282, 283	xi. 53	64
i. 8, 25	157			xi. 41, 53	64
i. 21, 11	197	KENT.		xi. 54	64
i. 31, 5	212	vol. iii. sect. 238	225	xi. 55, 62	65
i. 1, 19	19			xi. 70	65
ii. 8, 14	110	I. MACCABEES.		xi. 63, 74	65
ii. 8, 5	112	BOOK.		xii. 9	65
ii. 73	112	i. 13-14	15	xii. 21	66
ii. 21, 6-9	237	i. 15	16	xii. 24, 34	66
ii. 8, 1	248	i. 24	20	xii. 35, 37	67
ii. 2	255	i. 14	21	xii. 39, 53	68
ii. 13, 6	255	i. 41, 50	21	xiii. 1, 9	68
ii. 13, 6	256	i. 31, 32, 39	22	xiii. 10-11	69
ii. 4, 1	257	i. 51	22	xiii. 12, 30	69
ii. 14, 2	259	i. 62, 64	23	xiii. 36, 40	69
ii. 8, 14	107, 108	i. 60, 61	23	xiii. 43, 48	71
ii. 17, 2	260	ii. 34	17	xv. 37	88
ii. 15, 2	260	ii. 1, 14	25	xv. 4, 15	90
ii. 16, 4	260	ii. 19, 22	25	xv. 25, 49	91
ii. 14, 4-5	261	ii. 24, 26	26	xv. 24	92
ii. 14, 6, 9	261	ii. 27, 30	26	xv. 15, 24	92
ii. 17, 1, 4	262	ii. 30, 41	26	xv. 6	93
ii. 17, 4-6	263	ii. 70	28		
ii. 17, 7, 10	263	iii. 10, 12	30	II. MACCABEES.	
ii. 18, 1, 8	264	iii. 18, 22	30	BOOK.	
ii. 18, 10-11	264	iii. 23-24	30	i. 10	80
ii. 20, 3-4	264	iii. 31, 33	31	ii. 24, 232	5
ii. 20, 6	266	iv. 8, 11	32	ii. 19, 32	6
ii. 21, 1-2	266	iv. 28, 35	32	iv. 7-15	15
		iv. 36-37	34		

INDEX TO REFERENCES

	Page		Page		Page
iv. 9	16	PLUTARCH, "ANTONIUS."	186	STRABO. xvi. 2, 12	66
iv. 7, 10	18			SUETONIUS, "OCTAVIANUS." xiv, xv.	173
iv. 25	19	POLYB.		SUET., VESP. v., vi.	270
iv. 42, 47	19	xxxi. 2	39	TALMUD JER. KETHUBOTH. viii. 11	128
v. 6	20	xxxiii. 16	58	TAC. AN. xii. 66, 67	256
v. 25-26	21	xxxiii. 14, sect. 1	58	ii. 42, 43	251
vi. 2, 4	22	PSALMS OF SOLOMON.		TAC. HIST. v. 9	255
vi. 10	23 132, 136, 137, 139, 156, 157, 229		ii. 1, 4	270
vi. 18, 31	24	SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS.		v. 12	273
x. 1, 8	35	ii. 8	223	WEBER, JÜDISCHE THEOLOGIE.	125
xi. 1, 12	33	SCHURER. i. 1, 227	130		
xii. 32, 37	38	SON OF SIRACH. xxxviii. 24	22		
xii. 35	38				
xiv. 1	46				
xv. 12, 16	49				
MISHNA SOTA.					
vii. 8	244				
PHILO, DE MONARCHIA.					
ii. 1	282				

INDEX TO REFERENCES

	Page		Page		Page
DEUTERONOMY.		HAGGAI.		LUKE.	
vi. 4, 9	219	ii. 3, 9	200	xiii. 1	239
xxiii. 13, 2	219	MATTHEW.		xxiii. 6, 11	239
ISAAH.		ii. 4, 6	214	ACTS.	
xiv. 19	74	iv. 10	249	v. 37	249
DANIEL.		xiv. 53	250	xii. 3	244
vii. 2	108	xxi. 31	249	xxiv. 24	256
		xxiii. 6, 7	224	HEBREWS.	
		MARK.		i. 3	83
		vi. 17, 29	238		

Y